

Melnick, Helaine (Self), Austin, TX
Michol, Tracey (SILC), Fort Worth, TX
Mills, Karla (ACORN), Hou, TX
Miragliotta, Sharlene (Self), Frisco, TX
Mohlman, Dean (Self), Austin, TX
Money, Joseph (Senate District 22), Waco, TX
Mora, Sergio (Self), Laredo, TX
Morris-Parker, J. Laverne (Self), Austin, TX
Morrow, Christine C. (ARCIL), Austin, TX
Murph, Leonard C. (Self), N. Richland Hills, TX
Murphy, Theresa (Self), Smithville, TX
Nathan, Catherine S. (Self), Spring Branch, TX
Nathan, Richard D. (Self), Spring Branch, TX
Norton, LMSW, John, (Self), Austin, TX
Overstreet, Morris L. (Self), Prairie View, TX
Padma-Munyon, Leashya (Self), Austin, TX
Page, Dan (Self), Austin, TX
Painchaud, Kathy (UMW), Bellville, TX
Paul, Gilbert (Self), West Columbia, TX
Pena, Roman (LULAC), SA, TX
Perez, Mirella (The ARC of Texas), Austin, TX
Pina, Johanna (The ARC of Texas), Austin, TX
Poplawsky, Amanda (La Fe Policy Research and Education Center), Boerne, TX
Powell, Milton E. (Killeen GOTV), Killeen, TX
Ray, Ryan (Tarrant County Democratic Party), Fort Worth, TX

Rendon, Manuel (LULAC), Austin, TX
Renick, Karen (Vote Rescue), Austin, TX
Revely, Porshe (Huston Tilliston University), Austin, TX
Rhea, Paul (Self), Austin, TX
Richie, Boyd (Texas Democratic Party), Austin, TX
Riegel, Daniel (Self), Austin, TX
Riker, Jennifer (Self), Austin, TX
Rizzo, Melissa (ARC of TX), Georgetown, TX
Roberts, Patricia (Bell County Democratic Women), Harker Heights, TX

Roberts, Susan K. (Self; Women for Good Government), Austin, TX
Rochester, Liz (Self), Dallas, TX
Rodriguez, Chris (Self), Austin, TX
Rovezzi, Cynthia M. (People with Disabilities), Plano, TX
Rovezzi, Kristen (Disabled constituents), Plano, TX
Rowland, Brian (Texas NAACP), Prairie View, TX
Ruiz, Lilia (Camino Real Mexican American Democrats El Paso), El Paso, TX
Ruiz, Philip A. (Texas Democratic County Chairs Assn. (TDCCA)), Lockhart, TX
Saenz, Danny (Self), Austin, TX
Salvatore, Robert (S.A. Building Trades Cafb-CIO), San Antonio, TX
Sanchez, Claudia (LULAC), San Antonio, TX
Scott, Roseanne (Self), Austin, TX
Sells, Greg (Self), Austin, TX
Shelton, Susan (Self), Austin, TX
Sibbet, Byron (Self), North Richland Hills, TX
Sikes, Vanessa M. (Self), Austin, TX
Silva, Omar (Self), San Antonio, TX
Silver, Paul (Common Cause of TX), Austin, TX
Simpson, Dee (AFSCME, AFL-CIO), Austin, TX
Sirrianni, Susi (Self), Austin, TX
Smith, Briana (Blind), New Caney, TX
Smith, Russell N. (TX Freedom), Austin, TX
Smith, Wanda (Parent), Austin, TX
Sneed, L. Randy (ARCIL, Inc.), Pflugerville, TX
Snider, Stewart (Self), Austin, TX
Speight, Dennis (Self), Austin, TX
Stafford, Mildred (ACORN), Houston, TX
Statman, Rona (Self), Austin, TX
Steele, Borrell (ADAPT), Austin, TX
Steele, Mary (ADAPT), Austin, TX
Stephenson, R. Robert (Self), Austin, TX
Stevens, D. Shawn (Self), Dallas, TX
Stine, Daniel (Self), Austin, TX
Tafoye, Marcelo (LULAC, District 12), Austin, TX

Tapia, Michael (Self), San Antonio, TX
Telge, Judy (Self; C.B D. Ctr. for Independent Living), Corpus Christi, TX

Terrazas, Erica (Self), Austin, TX
Terrell, Randall (Equality Texas), Austin, TX
Thelen, Michael (Self), McQueeney, TX
Thomas, David R. (Self), Austin, TX
Thomas, Delisha (Self), Austin, TX
Thomas, Stephanie (National ADAPT), Austin, TX
Thompson, Mary E. (Self), Austin, TX
Tilley, Tracy (TX SILC), Belton, TX
Torres, Margaret (ACORN), Houston, TX
Torres, Richard (Self), Round Rock, TX
Toussaint, Aerin-Renee (Self), Austin, TX
Traynham, Warner (Self), SA, TX
True-Courage, Zada (Self), San Antonio, TX
Tucker, M.D., Byron (Self), San Antonio, TX
Urby, M.D., Rodolfo M. (La Fe Policy and Education Research Center), San Antonio, TX
Vackimes, Alexandra (Self), Manor, TX
Van Praag, Jane Leatherman (Self), Bartlett, TX
Varela, Ralph (Self), Austin, TX
Vasquez, Peggy (LULAC), Austin, TX
Vaughn, Mercedes (Self), Austin, TX
Viagran, Crystal (Travis County PCT 426), Austin, TX
Villarreal, Jesse (Self; Senate District 22), Waco, TX
Vo, Ramey (Self), Austin, TX
Vodnick, Lynn (Self), Austin, TX
Vogel, Vickie (SD 18), La Grange, TX
Wagoner, Jordan (Self), Austin, TX
Walters, Barbara Boyden (TX Democratic Women of Collin County), Plano, TX
Whalen, Suzanne (Self), Dallas, TX
Wheeler, Dianne H. (TX Freedom Network), Austin, TX
Williams, B.J. (NAACP Garland Branch), Garland, TX
Williams, Doris (Self), Austin, TX

Williams, Janice (Self), Austin, TX
Williams, Robert Wayne (Self), Austin, TX
Wilson, Andy (Public Citizen, Common Cause), Austin, TX
Windberg, Thomas J. (Self), Spicewood, TX
Wisdom, Barbara R. (Self), Austin, TX
Wittie, David (ADAPT of Texas), Austin, TX
Woods, Traci (Tarrant County Democratic Party), Fort Worth, TX
Wygall, Shondra E. (Texas Young Democrats), Houston, TX
Yarber, John (Self), Austin, TX
Yarbrough, Christianna (South Denton County Democrats and TX Precinct 307), Flower Mound, TX
Yeaman, John F. (Self), Austin, TX
Young, Deana (Private Citizen), Houston, TX

On:

Banks, Annie M. (Texas Alliance for Retired Americans), Houston
Curry, Susan (Self), Alpine, TX

Harris, R.D. (Cover Texas NOW/Dallas ACORN), Dallas, TX
Higgins, Carlos (Texas Silver-Haired Legislature), Austin, TX
Mays Sr., Kenneth W. (Self), Dallas, TX
Sepehri, John (Secretary of State), Austin, TX

Providing written testimony:

For:

Alvarez, Rosario (Granada Homes, Laborer, LU1095), San Antonio, TX
Gebolys, Paul J. (PCT 4, Montgomery County), The Woodlands, TX
Harding, James C. Presiding Judge (Harris County - Rep.), Kingwood, TX
Lannon, Robert "Grant" (Texas Borders Volunteers), Austin, TX
Lindsey, Shirley (Self), League City, TX
McDonald, Tony (Young Conservatives of Texas), Austin, TX
Mikus, Jr., Jerry J. (Self), Pflugerville, TX
Opiela, Eric (Republican Party of Texas), Austin, TX
Wallace, Skipper (Texas Republican County Chairs Association), Lampasas, TX

Against:

Bell, Doug (Travis County Democrats), Austin, TX
Burke, Terri (ACLU of Texas), Austin, TX

Dickinson, Glenda (Self), Sealy, TX
Dodd, Daniel (Democratic Party of Collin County), McKinney, TX
Flores, Jr., Enrique (UAW and Labor Council for Latin American
Advancement), Arlington, TX
Ford, Rachel Baker (Self), Garland, TX
Gauthier, Lloyd (Self), Houston, TX
Glasscock, Nancy (Self), Temple, TX
Henderson, Elaine (Self), Lago Vista, TX
Hinojosa, Gilberto (Cameron County Democratic Party - Committee Member,
Democratic National Committee), Brownsville, TX
Korbel, George (Self; LULAC), San Antonio, TX
Leeder, Jennie Lou (Llano County), Llano, TX
Mainard, Marcia (TDW), Greenville, TX
Resa, Arthur (Bell County Democratic Party), Belton, TX
Sanders-Castro, Judith (LULAC and Rosa Rosales, Nat'l Pres.), San Antonio, TX
Spoon, Harley (Self), Austin, TX
Vera, Jr., Luis (League of United Latin American Citizens), Washington, DC
Whichard, Steve (Self), Austin, TX

On:

Dean, Sheila (Self), Austin, TX

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE
THE SENATE OF THE STATE OF TEXAS
EIGHTY-FIRST LEGISLATURE
(COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE SENATE)
AUSTIN, TEXAS

IN RE: §
§
CONSIDERATION OF §
SENATE BILL 362 §

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 10, 2009

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT AT 12:38 p..m., on
Tuesday, the 10th day of March 2009, the above-
entitled matter was heard at the Texas State Capitol
Senate Chamber, Austin, Texas, before the Committee of
the Whole Senate; and the following proceedings were
reported by Aloma J. Kennedy, a Certified Shorthand
Reporter of:

VOLUME 1A

PAGES 1 - 208

KENNEDY

REPORTING

SERVICE

a record of excellence

1801 Lavaca • Suite 115 • Austin, Texas 78701 • 512-474-2233

TX_0003857
JA_003280
ORIGINAL

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2		PAGE
3	<u>VOLUME 1A</u>	
4	PROCEEDINGS, TUESDAY, MARCH 10, 2009	2
5	ROLL CALL NO. 1	2
6	OPENING INSTRUCTIONS BY SEN. DUNCAN	5
7	OBJECTION TO FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF SB 362	
8	(SEN. WEST)	12
9	ROLL CALL NO. 2	38
10	LAYING OUT OF SENATE BILL 362	
11	(SEN FRASER)	44
12	QUESTIONS FROM SENATE FLOOR	53
13	<u>VOLUME 1B</u>	
14	INVITED TESTIMONY	210
15	TESTIMONY BY HANS VON SPAKOVSKY	210
16	QUESTIONS FROM SENATE FLOOR	218
17	TESTIMONY BY TOVA ANDREA WANG	277
18	QUESTIONS FROM SENATE FLOOR	287
19	TESTIMONY BY CAMERON QUINN	300
20	QUESTIONS FROM SENATE FLOOR	306
21	TESTIMONY BY TOBY MOORE	336
22	QUESTIONS FROM SENATE FLOOR	344
23	TESTIMONY BY FRANK B. STRICKLAND	373
24	QUESTIONS FROM SENATE FLOOR	417
25	TESTIMONY BY ADAM SKAGGS	408
	QUESTIONS FROM SENATE FLOOR	417
	TESTIMONY OF ROBERT A. SIMMS	
	SUBMITTED BY WES TAILOR	435
	TESTIMONY BY J. GERALD HEBERT	442
	QUESTIONS FROM SENATE FLOOR	450

KENNEDY REPORTING SERVICE, INC.
512.474.2233

TX_00003858
JA_003281

TX_00003858

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2		PAGE
3	<u>VOLUME 2</u>	
4	PROCEEDINGS, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 2009	482
5	QUESTIONS FROM SENATE FLOOR (CONTINUED)	482
6		
7	TESTIMONY BY THOMAS WHEELER	502
8	QUESTIONS FROM SENATE FLOOR	510
9	TESTIMONY BY CHANDLER DAVIDSON	521
10	QUESTIONS FROM SENATE FLOOR	527
11	TESTIMONY BY ED JOHNSON	559
12	QUESTIONS FROM SENATE FLOOR	566
13	TESTIMONY BY DANIEL B. KOHRMAN	621
14	QUESTIONS FROM SENATE FLOOR	628
15	TESTIMONY BY COBY SHORTER	653
16	QUESTIONS FROM SENATE FLOOR	655
17	TESTIMONY BY DENNIS BOREL	706
18	QUESTIONS FROM SENATE FLOOR	713
19	TESTIMONY BY GARY GLEDSON	724
20	QUESTIONS FROM SENATE FLOOR	731
21	TESTIMONY BY ERIC NICHOLS	742
22	QUESTIONS FROM SENATE FLOOR	750
23	PUBLIC TESTIMONY	771
24	CLAIRE OXLEY GLUCK	771
25	HAZEL COTTON	773
	QUESTIONS FROM SENATE FLOOR	775
	KATHY HICKS	776
	JAMES E. CARTER	779
	RUSTY HICKS	781

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2		PAGE
3	PUBLIC TESTIMONY (CONTINUED)	
4	TINA BENKISER	784
5	B.R. SKIPPER WALLACE	787
6	ANITA PRIVETT	789
7	MARY ANN COLLINS	792
8	ROSA ROSALES	794
9	QUESTIONS FROM SENATE FLOOR	797
10	DUSTIN RYNDERS	800
11	MARSHA CORREIRA	803
12	QUESTIONS FROM SENATE FLOOR	806
13	RENE LARA	807
14	LEE MEDLEY	810
15	JOHN WATKINS	811
16	KENNETH FLIPPEN	813
17	ANNIE BANKS	816
18	RACHEL HERNANDEZ	817
19	RENATO DE LOS SANTOS	819
20	JUDY HOLLOWAY	823
21	LYDIA CAMARILLO	825
22	EDWARD B. WILLIAMS	828
23	MADELEINE DEWAR	830
24	HELEN VILLARREAL	833
25	MARK WILLIAMSON	835
	VANESSA FOSTER	838
	LUIS FIGUERO	840
	QUESTIONS FROM SENATE FLOOR	844
	PATTI EDELMAN	844
	SYLVIA MENDOZA	846
	KENNETH KOYM	848
	KAREN RENICK	850
	JONI ASHBROOK	853
	DUANE RAWSON	856
	ROD FLUKER	858
	ROLL CALL NO. 3	864
	PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED	869

1	EXHIBIT INDEX		
2		MARKED	ADMITTED
3	1A Sen. Van de Putte 3/3/09 Memo to Sen. Duncan re ground rules for Committee of the Whole Pubic hearing	21	21
5	1B Sen. Duncan 3/5/09 Memo to Sen. Van de Putte re response to concerns about ground rules for the Committee of the Whole Senate	21	21
8	2. Letter to Texas Attorney General Greg Abbott re: Hearing on SB 362, signed by 11 Senators	21	21
10	3. Senate Notice of Public Hearing on SB 362 for 3/10/09	21	21
11	4. Texas Senate Agenda, 3/10/09	21	21
13	5A 3/10/09 Tag Form signed by Sen. Royce West, et al	21	21
14	5B 3/10/09 Tag Form signed by Sen. Mario Gallegos	21	21
16	6. Roll Call No. 2 - Sen. Gallegos' Appeal of Ruling of Chair on Sen. West's Point of Order	120	120
18	7. Institute of Public Policy Publication entitled "The Effects of Photographic Identification on Voter Turnout in Indiana: A County-Level Analysis" by Jeffrey Milyo, Report 10-2007, Revised December 2007	120	120
23	24	25	

KENNEDY REPORTING SERVICE, INC.
512.474.2233

TX_00003861
JA_003284

1	EXHIBIT INDEX (continued)		
2		MARKED	ADMITTED
3	8. AU News publication entitled "Much-hyped Turnout Record Fails to Materialize - Convenience Voting Fails to Boost Balloting"		
4			
5		120	120
6			
7	9. Symposium paper entitled "The Empirical Effects of Voter-ID Laws: Present or Absent?" by Jason D. Mycoff, Michael W. Wagner and David C. Wilson		
8			
9		120	120
10			
11	10. 9/10/07 Report of the Heritage Center for Data Analysis entitled "New Analysis Shows Voter Identification Laws Do Not Reduce Turnout" by David B. Muhlhausen and Keri Weber Sikich		
12			
13		120	120
14			
15	11. <i>New York Times</i> article - September 23, 2005 - entitled "Voting Reform is in the Card's," by Jimmy Carter and James A. Baker III		
16			
17		160	160
18	12. Harvey Kronberg's Quorum Report April 23, 2007, entitled "Royal Masset: The Voter ID Bill Will Kill My Mother's Right to Vote"		
19			
20		160	160
21	13. 2/3/08 article entitled "A Clearer Picture on Voter ID" by Jimmy Carter and James A. Baker III		
22			
23		160	160
24	14. Testimony of Hans A. von Spakovsky, March 10, 2009, re SB 362		
25			
		217	217

KENNEDY REPORTING SERVICE, INC.
512.474.2233

TX_00003862
JA_003285

1	EXHIBIT INDEX (continued)		
2		MARKED	ADMITTED
3	15A 6/11/07 Letter to Senate Committee on Rules and Administration re Hans A. von Spakovsky nomination	254	254
4	15B 6/12/07 Article entitled "Obama Raises Concerns Over FEC Nominee's Record of Partisanship"	254	254
5	15C 10/3/07 Letter to the U.S. Senate from Public Citizen	254	254
6	16. Institute of Public Policy Publication entitled, "The Effects of Photographic Identification on Voter Turnout in Indiana: A County-Level Analysis" by Jeffrey Milyo, Report 10-2007, Revised December 2007 (SAME AS EXHIBIT 7)	265	265
7	17. Testimony of Tova Andrea Wang, Vice President, Research Common Cause, March 10, 2009, re SB 362	300	300
8	18. Report of the Commission on Federal Election Reform entitled, "Building Confidence in U.S. Elections," September 2005	313	313
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

KENNEDY REPORTING SERVICE, INC.
512.474.2233

TX_00003863
JA_003286

1	EXHIBIT INDEX (continued)		
2		MARKED	ADMITTED
3	19.	Fifteen letters to the Hon.	
4		Dianne Feinstein, Chair, and the	
5		Hon. Robert F. Bennett, ranking	
6		minority member, U.S. Senate	
7		Committee on Rules and	
8		Administration:	
9	1.	6/29/07 letter from Hans	
10		A. von Spakovsky	
11	2.	3/22/07 letter from various	
12		members of Congress	
13	3.	3/13/07 letter from William	
14		H. Jordan	
15	4.	2/08/07 letter from Gary J.	
16		Smith	
17	5.	2/26/07 letter from P. K.	
18		Brunelli	
19	6.	3/01/07 letter from J. A.	
20		Borras	
21	7.	2/21/07 letter from Trey	
22		Grayson	
23	8.	2/20/07 letter from Beverly	
24		B. Kaufman	
25	9.	2/19/07 letter from Todd	
		Rokita	
	10.	2/16/07 letter from Frank	
		B. Strickland	
	11.	2/14/07 letter from Tom Lowe	
	12.	2/13/07 letter from	
		T. Rogers Wade	
	13.	2/14/06 letter from Johnny	
		Isakson	
	14.	2/09/07 letter from Wesley	
		R. Kliner, Jr.	
	15.	3/13/07 letter from Ray	
		Martinez III	333 333
	20.	Brennan Center For Justice letter	
		dated October 3, 2007, by	
		Executive Director Michael	
		Waldman, with attachments	335 335

1	EXHIBIT INDEX (continued)		
2	MARKED	ADMITTED	
3	21. Prepared Remarks of Dr. Toby Moore, Research Triangle, regarding "Evidence of the impact of voter ID requirements and the prospects of US DOJ preclearance," March 10, 2009		358
4			358
5	22. Harris County Map submitted by Sen. Gallegos		366
6			366
8	23. Testimony of Frank B. Strickland re SB 362 March 10, 2009		373
9			373
10	24. Testimony of Adam Skaggs, Counsel, Democracy Program, Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law, regarding <i>The Myth of Voter Impersonation Fraud at the Polls</i> March 10, 2009		408
11			408
12	25. Written Testimony of Robert A. Simms, Georgia Deputy Secretary of State, presented to the United States Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, submitted by Wes Taylor		435
13			435
14	26. Testimony of J. Gerald Hebert re SB 362, March 10, 2009		442
15			442
16	27. Letter from Rene Guerra (March 6, 2009) Criminal District Attorney of Hidalgo County, Submitted by Sen. Lucio		479
17			479
18	28. 3/4/09 Letter from Todd Rokita, Indiana Secretary of State, to Sen. Fraser re SB 362		502
19			502
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

KENNEDY REPORTING SERVICE, INC.
512.474.2233

TX_00003865
JA_003288

1	EXHIBIT INDEX (continued)		
2	MARKED	ADMITTED	
3	29. Testimony of Chandler Davidson, Tsanoff Professor of Public Affairs Emeritus, Rice University, regarding "The Historical Context of Senate Bill 362," March 10, 2009		
6	521	521	
7	30. 3/06 Printout from Texas AG Website entitled "Helping Stamp Out Voter Fraud in Texas," by Greg Abbott, Attorney General of Texas, submitted by Sen. Shapleigh		
9	550	550	
10	31. Dashwood case documents submitted by Ed Johnson, Harris County Tax Assessor-Collector and Voter Registrar's Office		
11	559	559	
12	32. Records from specific Harris County voting documents, submitted by Ed Johnson		
13	559	559	
14	33. Harris County Deceased Voting History, miscellaneous registration applications, submitted by Ed Johnson		
15	559	559	
16	34. Texas Voter Registration Application form submitted by Sen. Huffman		
17	570	570	
18	35. Testimony of Daniel B. Kohrman, Senior Attorney, AARP Foundation, re SB 362 March 10, 2009		
19	621	621	
20	36. Photographs of Voter Education, Anderson County Workshop, 2008		
21	724	724	
22	37. Testimony of Gary L. Bledsoe, President, Texas NAACP, re SB 362, March 10, 2009		
23	724	724	
24			
25			

KENNEDY REPORTING SERVICE, INC.
512.474.2233

TX_00003866
JA_003289

1	EXHIBIT INDEX (continued)		
2		MARKED	ADMITTED
3	38. Number of voters who have registered since 2006 without a driver's license number, submitted by Sen. Watson	767	767
5	39. The Special Investigations Unit Role and Investigative Efforts and Funding, submitted by Sen. Huffman	767	767
8	40. Slip Opinion, U.S. Supreme Court, <u>Crawford vs. Marion County Election Board</u> , October Term, 2007	768	768
10	41. U.S. Supreme Court, <u>Crawford vs. Marion County Election Board</u> , on Writ of Certiorari to U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, Brief of Texas, Alabama, Colorado, Florida, Hawaii, Michigan, Nebraska, Puerto Rico and South Dakota, as <i>Amici Curiae</i> Supporting Respondents	768	768
16	42. Written Testimony of Claire Oxley Gluck from Boerne, in Kendall County, re SB 362	773	773
18	43. Written Testimony of Hazel Cotton of Texarkana, Texas re SB 362	775	775
20	44. Written Testimony of Kathy Hicks of Texarkana, Texas re SB 362	779	779
22	45. Written Testimony of Donald Giles of Texarkana, Texas re SB 362	783	783
24	46. Written Testimony of Anita Privett, League of Women Voters of Texas, re SB 362	789	789
25			

KENNEDY REPORTING SERVICE, INC.
512.474.2233

TX_00003867
JA_003290

1	EXHIBIT INDEX (continued)		
2		MARKED	ADMITTED
3	47. Written Testimony of Rosa Rosales, League of United Latin American Citizens, National President re SB 362		
4			
5		794	794
6	48. Written Testimony of Dustin Rynders, Advocacy, Inc., re SB 362		
7			
8		800	800
9	49. Written Testimony of Marsha Correia re SB 362		
10			
11		804	804
12	50. Written Testimony of Rachel A. Hernandez re SB 362		
13			
14		817	817
15	51. 10/17/08 Article by Nelda Wells Spears, Voter Registrar, Travis County, entitled "40,000 Voter Registration Applications Processed in Time For Early Voting"		
16			
17		825	825
18	52. Written Testimony of Lydia Camarillo, SVREP Vice President, re SB 362		
19			
20		826	826
21	53. Written Testimony of Luis Figueroa, Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF), re SB 362		
22			
23		841	841
24	54. Written Testimony of Sylvia Mendoza re SB 362		
25			
		848	848
	55. Written Testimony of Dr. Rod Fluker, Sr., Executive Director for Texas Association of Black Personnel in Higher Education, re SB 362		
		861	861

KENNEDY REPORTING SERVICE, INC.
512.474.2233

TX_00003868
JA_003291

P R O C E E D I N G S

TUESDAY, MARCH 10, 2009

(12:38 p.m.)

PRESIDENT DEWHURST: Members, the Senate will come to order. Pursuant to a resolution previously adopted, the Senate resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole for the consideration of Senate Bill 362. The senator from Lubbock, Sen. Duncan, will please take the chair for the duration of the proceedings in the Committee of the Whole.

(Off the record: 12:38 p.m. to 12:42 p.m.)

SEN. DUNCAN: The Committee of the Whole Senate will come to order. The secretary will call the roll.

ROLL CALL NO. 1

SECRETARY SPAW: Averitt?

SEN. AVERITT: (Indicated presence)

SECRETARY SPAW: Carona?

SEN. CARONA: (Indicated presence)

SECRETARY SPAW: Davis?

SEN. DAVIS: (Indicated presence)

SECRETARY SPAW: Deuell?

SEN. DEUELL: (Indicated presence)

1 SECRETARY SPAW: Duncan?
2 SEN. DUNCAN: (Indicated presence)
3 SECRETARY SPAW: Ellis?
4 SEN. ELLIS: (Indicated presence)
5 SECRETARY SPAW: Eltife?
6 SEN. ELTIFE: (Indicated presence)
7 SECRETARY SPAW: Estes?
8 SEN. ESTES: (Indicated presence)
9 SECRETARY SPAW: Fraser?
10 SEN. FRASER: Here.
11 SECRETARY SPAW: Gallegos?
12 SEN. GALLEGOS: (Indicated presence)
13 SECRETARY SPAW: Harris?
14 SEN. HARRIS: (Indicated presence)
15 SECRETARY SPAW: Hegar?
16 SEN. HEGAR: (Indicated presence)
17 SECRETARY SPAW: Hinojosa?
18 SEN. HINOJOSA: (Indicated presence)
19 SECRETARY SPAW: Huffman?
20 SEN. HUFFMAN: (Indicated presence)
21 SECRETARY SPAW: Jackson?
22 SEN. JACKSON: (Indicated presence)
23 SECRETARY SPAW: Lucio?
24 SEN. LUCIO: (Indicated presence)
25 SECRETARY SPAW: Nelson?

KENNEDY REPORTING SERVICE, INC.
512.474.2233

TX_00003870
JA_003293

TX_00003870

1 SEN. NELSON: (Indicated presence)
2 SECRETARY SPAW: Nichols?
3 SEN. NICHOLS: (Indicated presence)
4 SECRETARY SPAW: Ogden?
5 SEN. OGDEN: (Indicated presence)
6 SECRETARY SPAW: Patrick?
7 SEN. PATRICK: (Indicated presence)
8 SECRETARY SPAW: Seliger?
9 SEN. SELIGER: Here.
10 SECRETARY SPAW: Shapiro?
11 SEN. SHAPIRO: (Indicated presence)
12 SECRETARY SPAW: Shapleigh?
13 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: (Indicated presence)
14 SECRETARY SPAW: Uresti?
15 SEN. URESTI: (Indicated presence)
16 SECRETARY SPAW: Van de Putte?
17 SEN. VAN de PUTTE: (Indicated presence)
18 SECRETARY SPAW: Watson?
19 SEN. WATSON: (Indicated presence)
20 SECRETARY SPAW: Wentworth?
21 SEN. WENTWORTH: Here.
22 SECRETARY SPAW: West?
23 SEN. WEST: (Indicated presence)
24 SECRETARY SPAW: Whitmire?
25 SEN. WHITMIRE: (Indicated presence)

KENNEDY REPORTING SERVICE, INC.
512.474.2233

TX_00003871
JA_003294

TX_00003871

1 SECRETARY SPAW: Williams?

2 SEN. WILLIAMS: (Indicated presence)

3 SECRETARY SPAW: Zaffirini?

4 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: (Indicated presence)

5 SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair present.

6 SECRETARY SPAW: Mr. President?

7 PRESIDENT DEWHURST: (Indicated

8 presence)

9 SEN. DUNCAN: A quorum is present.

10 **OPENING INSTRUCTIONS BY SEN. DUNCAN**

11 SEN. DUNCAN: Members, before we get
12 started, I wanted to kind of briefly discuss how we
13 will proceed here. And I think you all know the
14 resolution gives the Chair the power to allow time
15 limits. Many of you have wanted to bring and begin
16 with invited testimony, and those would be persons
17 with expertise that can help the body understand the
18 issues involved in the legislation that we are about
19 to consider, and that will be honored. Each side has
20 submitted a list of witnesses, and I assume the order
21 of those witnesses is available to us at this time.

22 After the author of the bill is
23 recognized to lay out the bill, then I will recognize
24 the proponents' first witness, their expert in support
25 of their bill. And then after that, we will go in

1 alternating order so that then those who are in
2 opposition to the bill, if they want to bring witness
3 expert or invited witness in, then we would go in that
4 order.

5 So, in other words, we'll have one for
6 and one against, one for and one against as we go
7 through. There are several of those witnesses. I
8 believe there are eight witnesses that have been
9 identified by those in opposition to the bill, and
10 there are about seven that have been identified for
11 those in favor of the bill. So we will move that on.

12 The Chair will impose on each one of
13 those witnesses a 10-minute time limit. However, Sen.
14 Van de Putte indicates that they have one witness that
15 may take longer than that. And if you'll approach the
16 bench before, or the dais before that person comes on,
17 Sen. Van de Putte, we will adjust that time limit to
18 accommodate the concerns that you raised.

19 Members, I'm going to refrain from
20 recognizing any member to interrupt a witness during
21 their initial time limit. In other words, we will
22 allow the witnesses to complete their testimony, and
23 then you can ask questions after that. You will be
24 recognized in order of your pressing your call button
25 on your desk.

1 And I will remind each and every one of
2 you, we have a number of guests who are here today, or
3 members of the public who wish to testify as well, and
4 they have been here since about 8 o'clock in the
5 morning and they would like to testify on this bill.
6 And so what we are trying to do is accommodate their
7 interest as well.

8 I know that you all have important
9 questions to ask of the invited witnesses, but I would
10 ask you to keep in mind that we have members of the
11 public who have also traveled here from other cities
12 and other areas of the state that would like to have
13 their voices heard today as well. So if we could
14 respect that as well.

15 Once we conclude with the invited
16 testimony, then we will start the process for public
17 testimony. The Chair intends to impose a three-
18 minute time limit on public testimony. As with
19 invited witnesses, the Chair will not entertain any
20 questions of the witness until they have completed
21 their three-minute testimony or concluded prior to the
22 three minutes.

23 As the persons have enrolled to testify,
24 the resolution requires -- and I think our rules have
25 always required -- that before a witness can testify,

1 they sign an affirmation that is more or less an oath,
2 or is an oath before they testify. Persons who have
3 been filling out their cards have been doing that all
4 day long, and we have a procedure in there for them to
5 sign up to testify.

6 It's my understanding that the Secretary
7 of the Senate has done a nice job of preparing
8 instructions for them on how the process will work.
9 And they have been given written instructions on how
10 they will be called. It is the Chair's intention to
11 call the witnesses in the order in which they arrived
12 and registered to be witnesses today. Each one of
13 those cards was given a number, and those witnesses
14 will be called in order.

15 And there is always a problem with
16 witnesses who are not available at the time they're
17 called. We will have witnesses hopefully in the
18 gallery. The gallery is not full. So if you know
19 you're going to testify and your number is fairly
20 close, you should be in the gallery. We also have an
21 overflow room in the auditorium. Everybody has been
22 instructed as to that. It's the Chair's intention to
23 call witnesses in advance of their being on the floor,
24 and they are to report in the back hallway. And then
25 there is a process for security and a process for

KENNEDY REPORTING SERVICE, INC.
512.474.2233

TX_00003875
JA_003298

TX_00003875

1 admitting them to the floor.

2 We will have them come through here and
3 give us testimony in an orderly fashion. And if
4 someone does not arrive at the time their name is
5 called or within 30 minutes of their name -- let me
6 repeat that and be clear. If a witness does not
7 arrive within 30 minutes of the time their name will
8 be called, then they will lose their opportunity to
9 testify. So we're going to try to be very flexible in
10 trying to allow people time to get here. But we need
11 to be able to stay on schedule and move -- and respect
12 every other witness' right to be heard.

13 Time limits are -- I think all of our
14 committees observe time limits. At least the ones
15 that I serve on do. And time limits are not designed
16 to limit the testimony that witnesses have to say;
17 it's designed to allow everyone who has presented to
18 testify, if possible. And so what I'm concerned
19 about, in putting a time limit in, is that people
20 understand that your time limit is based on the fact
21 that there are many people that want to testify, and
22 so we need to allow them to have their opportunity as
23 well.

24 Finally, we had a little discussion
25 about this in the discussion on the resolution when we

1 were in session. The rules of decorum of the Senate
2 will be enforced. And that means for those in the
3 gallery, that we -- the rules of the Texas Senate do
4 not permit clapping or applause, when we're in a
5 deliberative session like this, do not permit
6 clapping, applause or demonstrations. There may be
7 times when you wish to be excited about something you
8 agree with or disagree with, but it is inappropriate
9 in the Senate chamber to express that. There will be
10 no placards or billboards or things dropped over the
11 rail. Any of that will subject the person doing it to
12 being expelled from the Senate gallery.

13 And I'm sure it won't come do this, but
14 if it comes to this, it comes to a point in time to
15 where, after warning, the gallery generally is not
16 observing the rules of the Senate with regard to
17 decorum, well, then, the Chair would entertain a
18 motion at that time or may, on sua sponte, request
19 that the gallery be cleared. The only reason I say
20 that is, is that the decorum and the ability to hear
21 witnesses and to deliberate in a professional way on
22 this is very important. And those rules were designed
23 to allow us to do that, and they will be enforced.

24 So those in the gallery and those
25 watching on TV, please understand that. I would hate

1 to have to make a ruling or to have anyone removed
2 from the gallery, but we will need to do that if it
3 gets out of hand.

4 I need to clarify that the witnesses
5 should report to the front of the chambers. And I
6 always am confused about east, west, south, north or
7 front or back. But the front of the Senate chambers,
8 that would be the west doors next to the witness
9 registration desk, and that would be the door that's
10 closest to the rotunda in our Texas Senate.

11 Members, I want to introduce to you
12 today our court reporter, Aloma J. Kennedy of Kennedy
13 Reporting Service. She is an independent certified
14 shorthand court reporter, and she will be taking down
15 the testimony today. So it will be necessary for
16 either me or you to identify yourself in the record
17 whenever you speak or rise to testify or rise to ask a
18 question.

19 I'll probably just recognize you by
20 name, and the court reporter will get that. Because
21 the court reporter is a human being, we will need to
22 take a rest every now and then for her to rest her
23 fingers and arms, because she has a hard job.
24 Normally with a court reporter, every hour and a half
25 to two hours, and I'll let her kind of give me a

KENNEDY REPORTING SERVICE, INC.
512.474.2233

TX_00003878
JA_003301

1 signal whenever she is ready to take a five-minute
2 break.

3 Members, that's more or less the --
4 those are the issues and those are kind of the way
5 we're going to run things. So having explained that,
6 the Chair lays out Senate Bill 362 and recognizes
7 Sen. Fraser to explain the bill.

8 **OBJECTION TO FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF SB 362**

9 SEN. WEST: Mr. Chairman?

10 SEN. DUNCAN: Sen. West, for what
11 purpose?

12 SEN. WEST: Objection on further
13 consideration -- any consideration of Senate Bill 362
14 in that it violates Rule 11.18 and also would raise
15 Rule 11.10. Rule 11.18 is, "No bill may be reported
16 to the Senate before it has been the subject of an
17 open public hearing before a committee or
18 subcommittee."

19 My specific objection deals with the
20 notice. "Notice of the hearing on the bill must be
21 posted in a public place at lease 24 hours before the
22 hearing is to begin." The posting of notice on this
23 particular bill was at 6:22 p.m. on March the 9th;
24 therefore, any consideration before that would be in
25 violation of that rule.

1 SEN. DUNCAN: Sen. West, bring your
2 point of order forward.

3 (Off the record: 12:55 p.m. to
4 12:58 p.m.)

5 SEN. WEST: Mr. Chairman?

6 SEN. DUNCAN: Sen. West, for what
7 purpose?

8 SEN. WEST: Mr. Chairman, for further
9 clarification on my point of order for further
10 consideration of this bill at this time, I would raise
11 Rule 13.04. 13.04 governs the procedure in a
12 committee of the whole: "The rules of the Senate, as
13 far as applicable, shall be observed in Committee of
14 the Whole Senate."

15 And then I would raise our Rule No.
16 11.18 as relates to the posting of the bill being at
17 least 24 hours before the hearing is to begin. And
18 specifically the notice of the hearing must be posted
19 in a public place.

20 And then also I would raise Rule 11.10
21 in terms of the, "No committee or subcommittee, except
22 a conference committee, shall meet at least without 24
23 hours public notice."

24 (Off the record: 12:58 p.m. to
25 1:14 p.m.)

KENNEDY REPORTING SERVICE, INC.
512.474.2233

TX_00003880
JA_003303

TX_00003880

1 SEN. DUNCAN: Members, a point of order
2 has been raised. Rules 11.10 and 11.18 do not control
3 meetings of the Committee of the Whole and are
4 inapplicable. 13.01 reflects the Senate's manifest
5 right to resolve itself into committee of the whole at
6 any time after the morning call. The Senate has
7 resolved into the Committee of the Whole by Senate
8 resolution. The Chair may neither call a meeting of
9 the Committee of the Whole or schedule a bill for
10 hearing.

11 Article XI, standing and special
12 committees operate without direct day-to-day
13 supervision of the Senate. Standing and special
14 committees have the ability to meet, subject to the
15 call of the chair so long as the Senate is not
16 meeting.

17 Committee of the Whole presents the
18 obverse situation to standing and special committees.
19 The tag rule is intended to give each member 48-hour
20 written notice of the time and place of a public
21 hearing of standing and special committees. The rules
22 directly conflict with Rule 13.01 and the Senate's
23 right to resolve into the committee of the Whole at a
24 moment's notice if the Senate so desires. Every
25 member of the Senate is a member of the Committee of

1 the Whole, having equal rights of notice and
2 participation.

3 Your point of order is respectfully
4 overruled.

5 SEN. WEST: Mr. Chairman?

6 SEN. DUNCAN: Sen. West, for what --

7 SEN. WEST: Parliamentary inquiry. So
8 that I can understand this, under Rule 13.04, it says
9 that, "The rules of the Senate, as far as applicable,
10 shall be observed in the Committee of the Whole"
11 So by your very ruling, you're saying that the posting
12 notice to the public is a rule that the Committee of
13 the Whole does not have to abide by?

14 SEN. DUNCAN: Senator, that would
15 conflict with the ability in the rules of the Senate
16 to resolve into a committee of the whole at any time
17 it desires. So in its conflict, it would be
18 inapplicable.

19 SEN. WEST: So public notice does not
20 apply to the Committee of the Whole, even though we
21 are taking substantive testimony on this issue?

22 SEN. DUNCAN: Public notice laid out by
23 the rules that you have cited does not.

24 SEN. WEST: Okay. So for future
25 generations of legislators, specifically the Senate,

1 posting notice does not apply to the Committee of the
2 Whole? That's essentially the ruling? Let me ask
3 this question: Once . . .

4 SEN. DUNCAN: Go ahead, Senator.

5 SEN. WEST: You have cited Rule 13.01
6 that talks about resolving. Is resolving synonymous
7 with hearing a bill?

8 SEN. DUNCAN: Senator, the Senate can
9 resolve for whatever purpose it desires.

10 SEN. WEST: Right. And the question is,
11 you cited in your ruling that 13.01 provides the basis
12 for your ruling. And as I understand it, resolving is
13 coming into the Committee of the Whole, hearing a bill
14 that's separate from resolving. It's a separate act
15 than just resolving.

16 SEN. DUNCAN: Well, Senator, we can
17 resolve for any purpose, and the purpose was to hear
18 the bill. Moreover -- and I will remind you that a
19 courtesy posting on the date, time and location of the
20 hearing was performed over a week ago, which is well
21 in advance of any public notice that would be required
22 of a standing committee. And so the only change that
23 you have referred to was a courtesy posting that was
24 done yesterday with regard to the change of time that
25 occurred whenever there was a motion to adjourn until

1 10:00 instead of 9:00, and so we're talking about an
2 hour's difference here. So, again, I think that we
3 have resolved by resolution of the Senate to deal with
4 this. The Senate certainly was in session pursuant to
5 the constitution and the rules of the Senate.

6 SEN. WEST: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. But
7 the broader question, though, is one of resolving and
8 hearing the bills and whether or not public notice of
9 bills that are to be considered by the Committee of
10 the Whole are required by the Senate rules.

11 I mean, essentially you're saying that
12 the Committee of the Whole, by your ruling, that we
13 don't have to provide the public notice, there is
14 no -- we don't have to deal with transparency as
15 relates to considering bills in this committee, we can
16 just do it at our own whim, and that's inconsistent
17 with everything we've been doing in this body in terms
18 of transparency. If I'm wrong about it -- I just want
19 to make sure the record is clear.

20 And historically, Mr. Chairman, when we
21 have had bills in the Committee of the Whole, we have
22 provided notice to the public so that the public could
23 be here like they are now. And what I'm hearing today
24 is, is that that notice provision is not applicable
25 anymore as a result of the ruling of the Chair. I

1 mean, correct me if I'm wrong.

2 SEN. DUNCAN: Senator, we are resolved
3 into a Committee of the Whole by the resolution we
4 adopted which laid out the bill that was to be
5 considered. As a result, we thought we were following
6 the rules by resolving into a Committee of the Whole
7 which would apply at any time we so desire; therefore,
8 the rules that you're citing to would conflict with
9 the ability of the Senate to freely resolve into a
10 Committee of the Whole to more informally discuss and
11 debate witnesses -- or the issues, including the
12 invitation of witnesses to come in and testify, as we
13 have done here.

14 SEN. WEST: Does it also conflict with
15 Rule 13.04?

16 SEN. DUNCAN: Senator, 13.04 provides
17 the -- it provides for the conflicts that may occur
18 with the concept of committee of the whole and other
19 rules, by saying that the rules of the Senate apply,
20 if applicable. And if they conflict -- where they
21 conflict, those rules wouldn't apply.

22 SEN. WEST: And this is my last
23 question. So you're saying that the notice provision,
24 the notice to the public concerning legislation at the
25 Committee of the Whole will take up conflicts, with

1 the Committee of the Whole's right to resolve?

2 SEN. DUNCAN: Senator, the way the
3 Committee of the Whole operates and the design of that
4 from time immemorial would -- giving the Senate the
5 ability to resolve into itself as a Committee of the
6 Whole to informally debate an issue at any time it
7 desires would conflict with those posting rules.

8 SEN. WEST: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

9 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Mr. Chairman?

10 SEN. DUNCAN: Sen. Shapleigh, for what
11 purpose?

12 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: During the Senate
13 portion of this, before we got into committee, we had
14 a discussion there about some housekeeping matters
15 that I think we need to make very clear for this
16 record. This portion is being kept for the official
17 record by a stenographer hired by the Senate. Is that
18 correct?

19 SEN. DUNCAN: That's correct.

20 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: And for the purposes of
21 the official record, should it be transmitted to any
22 third party, we have agreed that the stenographer's
23 record may be utilized?

24 SEN. DUNCAN: I'm not sure I understand
25 your question. Would you repeat it?

1 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: If we have to establish
2 the official proceedings of what's happened here today
3 for, for example, the Department of Justice in
4 Washington, D.C., the record that is being made by the
5 stenographer whose equipment is there and who sits in
6 Patsy Spaw's office can be used to establish that
7 record?

8 SEN. DUNCAN: Senator, it's my
9 understanding that this will be a record that can be
10 used to establish the record of the testimony that is
11 given to the Senate, and the debate.

12 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Now, for the purposes
13 of making sure that we have the record to send, I
14 would like to talk a little bit about the procedure
15 for the Secretary of the Senate to take documents and
16 keep them to append to the record. We've had
17 discussions already about several documents, the
18 letters to and from Sen. Van de Putte and yourself,
19 the letter to AG Abbott, the notice of the posting
20 that Sen. West was talking about, and this green Texas
21 Senate agenda. Am I to understand that if we want
22 these made a part of the record, we can deposit them
23 with the Secretary of the Senate?

24 SEN. DUNCAN: I would suggest that you
25 do that, but I would also suggest that you identify

1 and just move to put them into the record so that you
2 have a clear marker of where they are and at what time
3 they came in so that whoever is reading the record
4 will have an opportunity to relate the documents to
5 the testimony.

6 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Well, at this time I
7 would like to, with your permission, mark and deliver
8 to her Exhibits 1A and B, Sen. Van de Putte's letter
9 to you and your response to her; as Exhibit 2, her
10 letter to AG Abbott; as Exhibit 3, the notice of the
11 posting time that Sen. West has talked about; as
12 Exhibit 4, the Senate agenda that was distributed
13 today; and Exhibit 5, the signed tag that brought this
14 point of order to the Chair.

15 SEN. DUNCAN: Your evidence is received.
16 (Exhibit Nos. 1 through 5 marked and
17 admitted)

18 SEN. DUNCAN: And it may be that what we
19 would do is just keep a numerical order of those
20 exhibits when they come in. But I put the challenge
21 on you to make sure that you get them marked and
22 submitted to the Secretary so they get into the record
23 appropriately.

24 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Thank you.

25 SEN. DUNCAN: Sen. Gallegos, for what

1 purpose?

2 SEN. GALLEGOS: Parliamentary inquiry.

3 Mr. Chairman, in lieu -- on the ruling on

4 Sen. West's -- what he asked for, I want to appeal the
5 ruling of the Chair on this issue.

6 SEN. WILLIAMS: Mr. President?

7 SEN. DUNCAN: Sen. Williams of Harris --
8 or Montgomery, rather.

9 SEN. WILLIAMS: I would move to table
10 the motion that Sen. Gallegos just made.

11 SEN. DUNCAN: Sen. Williams,
12 Sen. Gallegos.

13 (Off-the-record discussion at the bench)

14 SEN. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman -- or
15 Mr. President -- or Mr. Chairman, I guess I should
16 say.

17 SEN. DUNCAN: Sen. Williams.

18 SEN. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, I
19 respectfully will withdraw my motion to table. As I
20 understand, it's not appropriate to have a motion to
21 table an appeal to the ruling of the chair in
22 committee. However, I also believe that the rules
23 provide that that motion would be in order were we on
24 the floor. So it's my mistake. I withdraw my motion.

25 SEN. DUNCAN: Sen. Williams withdraws

1 his motion to table. Sen. Gallegos sends up an appeal
2 to the ruling of the Chair.

3 Sen. West, for what purpose?

4 SEN. WEST: Out of all due respect,
5 Mr. Chairman, I'm trying to figure out what rules
6 apply and what rules don't. And if we could just get
7 some idea of what Senate rules are going to apply and
8 then, you know, all of us will know exactly what the
9 rules are.

10 So I just need to know what rules apply.
11 I thought the Senate rules applied. But again,
12 there's some wiggle room in there, and I just want to
13 know how to proceed. As an example, the Attorney
14 General -- well, I'll come back to that. But again, I
15 just need to know what rules apply as it relates to --
16 you know, we can do anything we want to do, we can
17 resolve and pretty much do what we want to do. I'm
18 trying to figure out why his motion wouldn't be
19 honored.

20 SEN. DUNCAN: Senator, currently we are
21 in the motion of -- Sen. Gallegos has a motion to
22 appeal before the body. You have a parliamentary
23 inquiry. Why don't we handle that as those issues
24 come up. Let's go ahead and deal with the appeal of
25 the ruling of the Chair that has been raised by

1 Sen. Gallegos.

2 Sen. Gallegos, you're recognized to
3 speak on that.

4 (Brief pause)

5 SEN. WENTWORTH: Sen. Gallegos, you're
6 recognized to argue in favor of your motion.

7 SEN. GALLEGOS: Mr. Chairman, the reason
8 for my appeal is that evidently the rules are unclear
9 on what rules that we're going by on major
10 legislation, I think and I believe that the Senate
11 rule should be applicable to major legislation, such
12 as the bill that is trying to be laid out before us,
13 that any major piece of legislation under the Senate
14 rules, the ones that Sen. Royce West said. And I've
15 got another tag on similar rules, that I believe that
16 the Senate rules are applicable to major legislation
17 that's heard on this floor, whether it be Committee of
18 the Whole or regular Senate committee hearings.

19 And that is why, you know, until we find
20 out what rules that we're working on, I believe that
21 the rules of the Senate should be applicable to this
22 bill here, and that's why I'm appealing the ruling of
23 the Chair.

24 SEN. WENTWORTH: Okay. Members, a
25 motion -- I'm sorry. The Chair recognizes Sen.

1 Williams.

2 SEN. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, I would
3 like to speak on Sen. Gallegos' motion that's before
4 us.

5 SEN. WENTWORTH: You're recognized.

6 SEN. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

7 Respectfully, Sen. Gallegos, I would
8 encourage you to read the rules that we have on the
9 Committee of the Whole. And before I made this rule
10 change at the beginning of the session, I very
11 carefully looked at the rules of the Committee of the
12 Whole. And we also considered how that has worked,
13 because I wasn't familiar with it, quite frankly.

14 And it's clear to me, after reading this
15 and other documents that relate to parliamentary law,
16 that a ruling other than what the Chair has made would
17 put the body in conflict with itself. The purpose of
18 the Committee of the Whole is to allow the body to
19 dissolve into that committee and consider important
20 matters before the entire body.

21 And to require that the posting rule
22 apply before we could do that would be to restrict the
23 body's inherent ability to dissolve into the Committee
24 of the Whole. And so the standing committee rules, as
25 I understand it, don't apply universally to this

1 proceeding that we're in.

2 And I think it would be a grave mistake
3 for this body to try to impose upon ourselves a
4 posting rule so that if there's some important matter
5 that we need to consider in an informal basis like a
6 committee hearing, is not as we hear it on the floor,
7 it would unnecessarily restrict our ability to do so.

8 And there are many examples in our
9 history as a Senate where we have resolved into the
10 body of the whole and considered bills and legislation
11 without posting those things. So respectfully I just
12 wanted to point that out to the body, Mr. Chairman.

13 SEN. WEST: Will Sen. Williams yield?

14 SEN. WILLIAMS: I yield.

15 SEN. WENTWORTH: Sen. West, for what
16 purpose?

17 SEN. WEST: Question of Sen. Williams.

18 SEN. WENTWORTH: Do you yield to Sen.
19 West?

20 SEN. WILLIAMS: I yield.

21 SEN. WENTWORTH: He yields.

22 SEN. WEST: Sen. Williams, I recognize
23 that oftentimes we resolve and we don't post to take
24 up -- we resolve into the Committee of the Whole to
25 take up issues. But in this instance, we decided to

1 post, follow the Senate rules and post. And then we
2 decided to repost. And now we're hearing that posting
3 is not applicable to the Committee of the Whole. And
4 that's why I'm taking so much time on this, given the
5 issues of transparency that the public demands and I
6 know that you support.

7 The issue in my mind is, is that once we
8 set up and make this ruling, we're now telling the
9 public, we're now telling the State of Texas that this
10 committee can take up legislation without giving the
11 public notice. That's what we're saying.

12 SEN. WILLIAMS: Well, Sen. West,
13 respectfully, I think you turn the intent of the
14 posting rule on its head with your logic. And if the
15 purpose of the posting rule is so that the public can
16 have adequate notice, there is no argument that can be
17 made. This has been widely disseminated over the
18 Internet, in the popular media.

19 And, in fact, the posting here was
20 merely a courtesy. The purpose of the posting rule is
21 not primarily to notify the public. The primary
22 purpose of the posting rule is to make sure that the
23 other members of the body know what's going on when
24 you have a standing committee that comes together and
25 it's subject to the call of the chair.

1 It is an important secondary thing that
2 we also give notice to the public. But I don't think
3 you can reasonably argue that the public wasn't aware
4 of what proceedings were going to be taking place. We
5 have over 100 witnesses that have testified. And
6 surely you don't think, because it wasn't posted in
7 the back hall, that somebody didn't show up for this
8 meeting.

9 SEN. WEST: Sen. Williams, I understand
10 your logic. And, frankly, I'm kind of baffled by it.
11 The reality is, is that the decision that y'all are
12 going to make today is that the posting notice does
13 not apply to the Committee of the Whole. That's this
14 argument. And the reality is, is that when you decide
15 to post, there is a certain amount of things that we
16 have to do according to our rules. There are certain
17 rights and privileges and all of that that are tied to
18 that posting. When you repost, it resets the clock;
19 it resets the clock.

20 Here is the way I look at it: The
21 reality is this -- and you and I had this debate, you
22 and I had this debate when we were going through the
23 rules change -- you guys -- the majority of the body
24 decided to change the rules. Okay. And you have the
25 votes, you have the gavel, you change the rules. And

1 that's fine. I can deal with that. But those are the
2 rules.

3 I'm just saying, let's make certain
4 that, given the rules that we now have, that all of us
5 can apply those rules to this situation. And when we
6 sit up and say that the Senate of the whole -- the
7 Senate can resolve itself into the whole committee and
8 these rules, posting is not applicable, I think we
9 need to think about it.

10 I understand that we're dealing with
11 issues, you know, voting issues that was always
12 something that was very divisive in this body. But
13 what I'm saying to you, as my desk mate and as a
14 colleague, we're got to really think about the
15 decision that we're making today saying that when we
16 take up these types of issues, that posting should not
17 be applicable.

18 SEN. WILLIAMS: Sen. West, I appreciate
19 the courtesy that you've shown me in explaining your
20 side of this. And what I would politely try to point
21 out to you is that I don't believe that we are today
22 deciding that the posting rule doesn't apply to the
23 Committee of the Whole. That has been decided a long
24 time ago.

25 SEN. WEST: When was it decided?

1 SEN. WILLIAMS: That is a part of the
2 body of parliamentary law that exists already. And it
3 is in the spirit of what's in the rules that relate to
4 the Committee of the Whole and the purpose. So, yes,
5 we're reaffirming that that doesn't apply today. And
6 the mere act of giving public notice does not then
7 subject you to a rule that didn't apply before. And I
8 think that's the ruling that the Chair has made, and I
9 think correctly so.

10 Thank you, Sen. West.

11 SEN. WEST: Look forward to the vote.

12 SEN. WENTWORTH: The Chair recognizes
13 Sen. Lucio of Cameron County.

14 SEN. LUCIO: Will Sen. Williams please
15 yield for a question?

16 SEN. WENTWORTH: Sen. Williams, you
17 yield?

18 SEN. WILLIAMS: I yield.

19 SEN. WENTWORTH: Sen. Williams yields.

20 SEN. LUCIO: Thank you, Sen. Williams.

21 I think all of us will agree that rules
22 are important to this process and if we're not to
23 follow them, then as a point of clarification, maybe
24 you could tell me what other rules do not apply to
25 this extraordinary piece of legislation?

1 SEN. WILLIAMS: Well, Sen. Lucio, it
2 wouldn't be appropriate for me -- I'm not presiding
3 over this -- it wouldn't be appropriate for me to
4 presume the role of the chair of this Committee of the
5 Whole. I think it's up to his discretion on that.
6 And I think that my -- I'll leave it to -- rather than
7 say "to his discretion," I think I'll leave that to
8 the Chair to make those rulings as the issues come
9 forward.

10 My response was really centered at --
11 since the issues that Sen. Gallegos raised when he
12 explained his appeal to the ruling of the Chair. And
13 I would reiterate again that it's not my belief that
14 all of the standing committee rules apply to the
15 Committee of the Whole, that we should not restrict
16 ourselves on the ability to resolve into the body of
17 the whole. It is designed for the Senate to be able
18 to rapidly take up an issue with everyone involved.
19 It is a unique situation, much different than a
20 standing committee is.

21 And so there is a long history, as I
22 said, of this body resolving into the Committee of the
23 Whole to consider matters, resolutions and legislation
24 where no posting was done whatsoever. And to say that
25 the mere act of giving public notice then subjects you

1 to that rule is to turn the Senate rules on their
2 head, in my opinion.

3 SEN. LUCIO: Well, but, you know, they
4 shouldn't have been posted, then if that would have
5 been the case, in my opinion, as well. You're a very
6 good student of the rules, and that's why I asked this
7 question. I think we need to revisit the rules, and
8 we need to rewrite the rules so it can be very clear
9 and not have to waste the public's time next time we
10 have a proceeding as such.

11 SEN. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Sen. Lucio.

12 SEN. WENTWORTH: Sen. Van de Putte.

13 SEN. VAN de PUTTE: Thank you,
14 Mr. President. I would like to speak -- appeal -- and
15 not maybe particularly at Sen. Williams, but he brings
16 up some very interesting comments. According to our
17 Senate rules on 13.04, "The rules of the Senate, as
18 far as applicable, shall be observed in the Committee
19 of the Whole Senate."

20 So as far as applicable. And although
21 this question on this appeal is about posting, we
22 don't post when we go into Committee of the Whole.
23 And probably, as Sen. Williams has said, because we
24 don't know when we're going into the Committee of the
25 Whole. We don't know when we're going to go back into

1 the Committee of the Whole and resolve to talk about
2 the Easter vacation schedule and whether we should be
3 off on Holy Thursday and Good Friday. And although
4 that is important, it is about the logistics and the
5 work schedule.

6 This is very different. When the rules
7 of the Senate were changed on the first week of the
8 session, it was done so to circumvent our normal
9 two-thirds rule on one particular issue, voter ID.
10 And because there is a bill -- this is a legislative
11 bill -- it is not the Senate resolving to talk about a
12 holiday schedule; it is not the Senate that is
13 resolving to talk about should we go and attend
14 someone on the Senate, their parent's funeral and the
15 logistics for that; it is not the Senate resolving to
16 plan the retirement party for our former secretary of
17 the Senate, Betty King.

18 Those are the things that we do because
19 it is the business of the Senate. This is the
20 business of the people. And we are going to add
21 another barrier to the basic right to vote; and, yet,
22 by the ruling, we are going to say the people have no
23 business knowing that we're going to take up a
24 legislative bill.

25 And so maybe for the purposes of this

1 appeal -- this is special. You made it special. You
2 said this was more important than anything else. And
3 so we are taking up -- and maybe the posting is not --
4 Sen. Williams, I vehemently disagree with you. The
5 posting is not for our convenience. We're here; we
6 have staff. We know when we're going to meet. It is
7 for the public. It is because we are going to add
8 barriers to their basic right to vote, but they ought
9 to have the posting if the Senate is going resolve
10 into the Committee of the Whole to change the way and
11 the possess that they vote. It is their business.

12 And so this is very different from the
13 Committee of the Whole resolving to discuss a work
14 schedule or to plan a party or to make funeral
15 arrangements. This is the people's business. And I
16 would ask you to think on this appeal. What we are
17 saying is that when there is legislation before the
18 Committee of the Whole, that we don't have to give
19 notice.

20 Although notice was given -- and it is
21 very much appreciative -- to have this ruling set in
22 our Senate rules for the senators that may not even be
23 born yet, is a terrible precedent. It shuts the
24 public out. So because of the special order and
25 because we're meeting in the Committee of the Whole

1 for one bill that was deemed so important that it
2 couldn't go by regular Senate rules, didn't go to the
3 Committee of Jurisdiction, we changed that.

4 But we ought to at least afford the
5 public the opportunity to know, in future generations
6 when they're about to be asked, to change how they
7 vote and what processes are used. And so when I ask
8 you to think about the appeal, don't think about us,
9 think about all the wonderful Texans here who always
10 exercise their right to vote.

11 SEN. WENTWORTH: The Chair recognizes
12 Sen. Williams.

13 SEN. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

14 Well, Sen. Van de Putte, respectfully, I
15 would say they're here. People from both sides of the
16 issue are here. And I think the effect of Sen.
17 Gallegos's appeal would be to send them home so that
18 they couldn't participate in this process today.

19 SEN. WENTWORTH: Members, Sen. Gallegos
20 has appealed the ruling of the Chair. The Secretary
21 will call the roll. A vote of "Aye" --

22 SEN. GALLEGOS: Mr. Chairman?

23 SEN. WENTWORTH: Sen. Gallegos.

24 SEN. GALLEGOS: May I -- I want to reply
25 to Sen. Williams, if I may.

1 SEN. WENTWORTH: The Chair recognizes
2 Sen. Gallegos.

3 SEN. GALLEGOS: Sen. Williams, you know,
4 I respect your remarks. And let me just say what my
5 colleagues have already told you in their remarks.
6 You said it's a unique situation. It is. And you
7 said that there was Internet postings, the media that
8 has posted so, you know, everybody is supposed to
9 know.

10 Well, I beg to differ with you. This is
11 an issue that is unique because you made it unique
12 when we passed that resolution that completely did
13 away with the two-thirds rule. So when you said it's
14 a unique situation, it is, because only -- and only on
15 this issue do we do away with the two-thirds rule that
16 has always been a tradition of the Texas Senate.

17 And let me remind you, Senator, that we
18 got elected here, everybody on this floor, to notify
19 and at least let our constituents know what's going on
20 here. And I will be the last one to say to them that
21 I'm going to depend on Internet postings and the media
22 to post, you know, this unique bill that you have made
23 unique by the resolutions that we passed earlier this
24 session and doing away with the two-thirds rule on
25 this issue.

1 So I would really tell you,
2 Sen. Williams, that the only really way to tell the
3 people that elected you and me about this unique
4 situation that we have on this floor today is by
5 public posting, something that we were elected to do,
6 to tell them -- not the Internet, not the media or
7 anybody else, or the grapevine or whatever else you
8 want to call it.

9 It's a public posting; that's what it
10 is. And I will refer in my appeal to the rules that
11 Sen. Van de Putte did, 13.04. And it says, "The rules
12 of the Senate, as far as applicable, shall be observed
13 in Committee of the Whole Senate." And also on Rule
14 20.02, it says, "The President's ruling is subject to
15 appeal to the entire Senate."

16 And that's what I'm doing right now,
17 Mr. Chairman and Sen. Williams. With all due respect,
18 I do appeal the ruling of the Chair.

19 SEN. WENTWORTH: All right. Members,
20 Sen. Gallegos has appealed the ruling of the Chair. A
21 vote of "aye" will sustain the Chair; a vote of "nay"
22 will overturn the Chair.

23 The Secretary will call the roll.
24
25

ROLL CALL NO. 2

SECRETARY SPAW: Averitt?

SEN. AVERITT: I confirm.

SECRETARY SPAW: Carona?

SEN. CARONA: (Indicated "aye" vote)

SECRETARY SPAW: Davis?

SEN. DAVIS: Nay.

SECRETARY SPAW: Deuell?

SEN. DEUELL: (Indicated "aye" vote)

SECRETARY SPAW: Duncan?

SEN. DUNCAN: (Present, not voting)

SECRETARY SPAW: Ellis?

SEN. ELLIS: (Indicated "nay" vote)

SECRETARY SPAW: Eltife?

SEN. ELTIFE: (Indicated "aye" vote)

SECRETARY SPAW: Estes?

SEN. ESTES: (Indicated "aye" vote)

SECRETARY SPAW: Fraser?

SEN. FRASER: Aye.

SECRETARY SPAW: Gallegos?

SEN. GALLEGOS: (Indicated "nay" vote)

SECRETARY SPAW: Harris?

SEN. HARRIS: (Indicated "aye" vote)

SECRETARY SPAW: Hegar?

SEN. HEGAR: (Indicated "aye" vote)

KENNEDY REPORTING SERVICE, INC.
512.474.2233

TX_00003905
JA_003328

TX_00003905

1 SECRETARY SPAW: Hinojosa?
2 SEN. HINOJOSA: (Indicated "nay" vote)
3 SECRETARY SPAW: Huffman?
4 SEN. HUFFMAN: (Indicated "aye" vote)
5 SECRETARY SPAW: Jackson?
6 SEN. JACKSON: (Indicated "aye" vote)
7 SECRETARY SPAW: Lucio?
8 SEN. LUCIO: (Indicated "nay" vote)
9 SECRETARY SPAW: Nelson?
10 SEN. NELSON: (Indicated "aye" vote)
11 SECRETARY SPAW: Nichols?
12 SEN. NICHOLS: (Indicated "aye" vote)
13 SECRETARY SPAW: Ogden?
14 SEN. OGDEN: (Indicated "aye" vote)
15 SECRETARY SPAW: Patrick?
16 SEN. PATRICK: (Indicated "aye" vote)
17 SECRETARY SPAW: Seliger?
18 SEN. SELIGER: (Indicated "aye" vote)
19 SECRETARY SPAW: Shapiro?
20 SEN. SHAPIRO: (Indicated "aye" vote)
21 SECRETARY SPAW: Shapleigh?
22 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: (Indicated "nay" vote)
23 SECRETARY SPAW: Uresti?
24 SEN. URESTI: (Indicated "nay" vote)
25 SECRETARY SPAW: Van de Putte?

KENNEDY REPORTING SERVICE, INC.
512.474.2233

TX_00003906
JA_003329

TX_00003906

1 SEN. VAN de PUTTE: (Indicated "nay"
2 vote)

3 SECRETARY SPAW: Watson?

4 SEN. WATSON: (Indicated "nay" vote)

5 SECRETARY SPAW: Wentworth?

6 SEN. WENTWORTH: (Indicated "aye" vote)

7 SECRETARY SPAW: West?

8 SEN. WEST: (Indicated "nay" vote)

9 SECRETARY SPAW: Whitmire?

10 SEN. WHITMIRE: No.

11 SECRETARY SPAW: Williams?

12 SEN. WILLIAMS: (Indicated "aye" vote)

13 SECRETARY SPAW: Zaffirini?

14 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: (Indicated "nay" vote)

15 SECRETARY SPAW: Mr. President?

16 PRESIDENT DEWHURST: (Indicated "aye"
17 vote)

18 SEN. WENTWORTH: There being 19 ayes, 12
19 nays and one present, not voting, the ruling of the
20 Chair is sustained.

21 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Mr. Chair?

22 SEN. DUNCAN: Sen. Shapleigh?

23 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Welcome back.

24 SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you.

25 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Can we make that vote,

1 since we don't have electronically recorded votes, an
2 Exhibit 6?

3 SEN. DUNCAN: Yes, Senator. I think all
4 votes should be made part of the record, and they are
5 part of the record.

6 Sen. Fraser. The Chair recognizes
7 Sen. Fraser to lay out Senate Bill 362.

8 SEN. GALLEGOS: Mr. President?

9 SEN. DUNCAN: Sen. Gallegos, for what
10 purpose?

11 SEN. GALLEGOS: Mr. Chairman, I want to
12 tag this Senate Bill on Ruling 11.19 on 48-hour notice
13 to all Senate members, and I believe that's 11.19.

14 SEN. DUNCAN: Senator, bring your point
15 of order forward.

16 SEN. GALLEGOS: My tag is already up
17 there.

18 (Brief pause)

19 SEN. GALLEGOS: Mr. President, I would
20 move to tag the bill and request a 48-hour notice to
21 all Senate members pursuant to Rule 11.19.

22 SEN. DUNCAN: Senator, are you rising on
23 a point of order?

24 SEN. GALLEGOS: I'm tagging the bill.

25 SEN. DUNCAN: Let me rephrase the

1 question. I think you would have to raise a point of
2 order on further consideration of the bill, based on
3 the tag.

4 SEN. GALLEGOS: Well, I raise the point
5 of order to disallow any further consideration of
6 Senate Bill 362.

7 SEN. DUNCAN: Okay.

8 SEN. GALLEGOS: And I have done that in
9 reference by submitting a tag to the Secretary of the
10 Senate.

11 SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Sen. Gallegos.

12 For the reasons previously stated in the
13 prior point of order raised by Sen. West, your point
14 of order is respectfully overruled.

15 SEN. GALLEGOS: Thank you,
16 Mr. President.

17 SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Senator.

18 SEN. WEST: To make sure the record is
19 clear --

20 SEN. DUNCAN: Sen. West.

21 SEN. WEST: Parliamentary inquiry.

22 Sen. Gallegos, as well as some other members of the
23 Senate, filed a motion to tag for further
24 consideration of Senate Bill 362. Your ruling would
25 be the same as it relates to that motion, to tag also?

1 There were two motions to tag filed.

2 SEN. DUNCAN: Senator, the
3 interpretation and the basis for the overruling of
4 Sen. Gallegos' motion and your motion and a motion
5 with regard to the tag rule would be that the rules do
6 not apply -- are not applicable, and I've made that
7 ruling. And that would be -- the ruling would be
8 consistent with the earlier ruling I made on your
9 motion.

10 SEN. WEST: Okay. And I just wanted to
11 make certain that we're basically dealing with all the
12 tagged motions that were up there. So tagged rules
13 don't apply to a committee whole either when we're
14 taking up substantive legislation? And that's, in
15 essence, the ruling?

16 SEN. DUNCAN: Senator, for the reasons
17 that we explained earlier and I think for the reasons
18 that were abated by the Senate and prevailed in the
19 appeal, that the tag would not apply, the tag rule
20 would not apply to the Committee of the Whole.

21 SEN. WEST: Thank you.

22 SEN. DUNCAN: Sen. Fraser, you are once
23 again recognized. You have the floor with regard to
24 laying out Senate Bill 362.

25

1 LAYING OUT OF SENATE BILL 362

2 SEN. FRASER: Thank you, members. The
3 three-minute rule is in effect.

4 I've been sitting here for four hours
5 waiting to lay this out. And, actually, we have a lot
6 of discussion about how I should lay this out,
7 discussion on it. And I think the bill speaks for
8 itself. And I am going to be very brief, probably
9 three or four minutes, and allow the witnesses to move
10 forward, because I think we've wasted enough of the
11 public's time and that we should move forward with
12 hearing from the witnesses.

13 Members, this bill, I think probably
14 most of you are going to be very familiar with it.
15 It's something we've talked about a lot. Someone back
16 a while ago when we were having lunch asked me the
17 question, said, "How did the talk about this bill get
18 started"?

19 And I actually came back and sat down,
20 and I've got probably, interestingly, more research
21 and more reading and debate on this bill maybe than
22 one I've ever done, because I'm very interested in the
23 concept. But I think probably if you track it back in
24 our nation's history, is that we look at the ongoing
25 threat of voter fraud that this country has addressed

1 really since the start, it goes all the way back.

2 And we've got many places where we look.
3 One of them would be Tammany Hall, possibly the Kansas
4 City Pendergast machine. Here in Texas, we probably
5 should look no further to the 1948 Senate race when
6 the Duke of Duval delivered 201 of the 203 registered
7 voters in Box 13 in Jim Wells County in the race
8 between LBJ and Coke Stevenson. Maybe we refer back
9 to Mayor Richard Daley's Chicago machine in the 1960
10 presidential election where it was alleged that at
11 least one in every 10 votes potentially was a
12 fraudulent or illegal vote, and including multiple
13 votes by the dead that continues throughout our Texas
14 history, even looking at the activity over the
15 indictments and the convictions over the last several
16 years, clarifying that voter fraud not only is alive
17 and well in the United States, it's very alive and
18 well in Texas.

19 And I think that brings us forward to
20 why we're here today. I believe the danger of the
21 voter fraud has threatened the integrity of the entire
22 electoral process for the entire history of the United
23 States.

24 In 2005, I think a lot of you are
25 familiar with the fact that the Federal Election

1 Commission asked a bipartisan commission, and they
2 went out and they tried to get someone to head that up
3 from what I'll call the left, the former President of
4 the United States, Jimmy Carter, a Democrat president
5 that had been the governor of a state, Georgia, that
6 was a Section 5 Voter Rights Act state. They asked
7 him to be one of the co-chairs of a bipartisan
8 commission. Secretary of State James Baker was the
9 other side. That Commission was put in place to look
10 at voter fraud in the United States and come back with
11 a recommendation of how we address that.

12 That commission in, you know, their
13 reaffirming the danger said, "The elections are at the
14 heart of democracy. Americans are losing confidence
15 in the fairness of elections. And while we do not
16 have a crisis today, we need to address the problems
17 of our electoral system."

18 During that same time, the Supreme Court
19 made a ruling in Purcell and Gonzalez stating the
20 "Confidence in the integrity of our electoral
21 processes is essential to the functioning of our
22 participatory democracy. Voter fraud drives honest
23 citizens out of the democratic process and breeds
24 distrust of our government. Voters who fear" -- and I
25 emphasize the word "fear" -- "Voters who fear their

1 legitimate votes will be outweighed by fraudulent ones
2 will feel disenfranchised. '[T]he right of suffrage
3 can be denied by a debasement or dilution of the
4 weight of a citizen's vote just as effectively as by
5 wholly prohibiting the free exercise of the
6 franchise.'"

7 It hit very close to home in 2003 when
8 we had a member of our body that I served with. My
9 chairman when I was in the House of Representatives,
10 Steve Wolens, a Democratic House of Representative
11 member and a chairman from the Dallas area, in 2003,
12 he laid out a bill and made a passionate plea to the
13 Legislature because he believed that through voter
14 fraud, that there had been an effort not only for him
15 but also his wife that was the mayor of Dallas.

16 And he says in the bill that he laid out
17 in his appeal, "Rigged elections in Dallas with people
18 harvesting votes have destroyed our" -- he said, "The
19 ability to cast a vote and have our vote counted is
20 the bedrock of our democracy. We must do everything
21 possible to ensure the sanctity of the vote in our
22 state. And as a society, we must not tolerate the
23 disenfranchisement of our citizens any longer in
24 accusing a group in a Democratic primary of rigging
25 the election and harvesting votes."

1 That same Baker Commission, the Carter-
2 Baker Commission, in an editorial that President
3 Carter and Baker co-wrote, said, "At the end of the
4 day, there is considerable national evidence of
5 in-person voter fraud. And regardless of whether one
6 believed that voter impersonation is widespread or
7 relatively rare, there can be no serious dispute that
8 it is a real effect that can be substantial, because
9 in a close election, even a small amount of fraud
10 could make the margin of difference."

11 In 2005 that bipartisan commission that
12 was created by the election reform, recommended that a
13 fair, a free and fair election requires both ballot
14 security and access to voting. "We as a commission
15 have offered to bridge" or "a proposal to bridge the
16 partisan divide by suggesting a uniform voter ID."

17 That recommendation came from a former
18 President of the United States, had been put on a
19 commission by the Federal Election Commission. The
20 recommendation came because of a concern about voter
21 fraud. And he recommended in 2005 that we develop a
22 program for a uniform voter photo ID. The bill that I
23 lay out today is in response to that.

24 Senate Bill 362 is really pretty
25 straightforward. It's nothing more than when I walk

1 in to vote and I lay out my voter registration, that
2 that person across from me can recognize that I am who
3 I represent to be, that I am that person on the roll.
4 And I feel I have an obligation to represent that I am
5 a legal living person that has the right to vote and I
6 am that person on that roll.

7 Under Texas law today, we do not have
8 that ability. We're going to have witnesses come
9 forward today, and they're going to tell you about
10 cases. I have questions that I'm going to ask, and
11 one of the ones is going to be to the Secretary of
12 State. We're going to ask about if, when we go into a
13 voting booth, if someone could impersonate me and
14 steal my vote and what they could do about it.

15 And I think a lot of you are going to be
16 shocked at what our current law in Texas is today.
17 Without a doubt, there is the ability in Texas from a
18 lot of different directions or a different way for
19 someone to steal your identity, your right by your
20 voter registration and can vote, identify themselves
21 as you.

22 The Baker Commission -- and I'm sorry.
23 Let me back up a second and say one of the other
24 things that you're going to hear today is that we have
25 representatives from Indiana and Georgia. After the

1 Baker Commission recommended that the photo ID be
2 implemented, one of the first states to do a strict
3 photo ID was the State of Indiana. Theirs is very
4 straightforward. It says that the citizens, when they
5 vote, will show a photo ID. If someone doesn't have a
6 photo ID, the state will pay for it.

7 That law that was put in place actually
8 was in place during the 2006 election, and then again
9 in the 2008 election. It has withstood the challenges
10 through the court system. And this last year, the
11 U.S. Supreme Court confirmed a decision on the Indiana
12 bill in a majority opinion that was giver by John Paul
13 Stevens, which is generally considered a moderate to
14 left-leaning justice. He issued the majority opinion,
15 and the opinion was six to three confirming the voter
16 ID bill for Indiana.

17 Since then, there have been two election
18 cycles. I'm not going to go into the results of that,
19 because we have someone from Indiana that is going to
20 testify to that. But I think it's going to clearly
21 show that instead of somehow discouraging someone to
22 vote, it did just the opposite, that the vote total --
23 in fact, I'm going to go ahead you give you those,
24 because I think they're very important.

25 In Indiana over the last two election

1 cycles, Indiana had the fifth largest increase of
2 voter increase in the United States in the 2008
3 election. In the Democratic votes that were cast,
4 they were No. 1 in the nation. They were the largest
5 increase of Democrat votes in the nation, even though
6 next door in Illinois, where the presidential
7 candidate was from, had no photo ID registration.
8 Indiana had a strict photo ID registration. Indiana
9 doubled the increase of Illinois. It clearly showed
10 that there was not a suppression there.

11 Georgia, a Section 5 voter rights state,
12 they also implemented a strict voter photo ID bill.
13 This last election cycle, Georgia was the largest
14 increase in vote totals in the nation. Of all the
15 states, of the other states that did not have it,
16 Georgia, after they implemented their photo ID
17 legislation, had the largest increase in vote totals
18 in the nation. And we have people from Georgia here.

19 I think probably a brief description of
20 my bill, and we'll get into that. And if someone has
21 questions about 362 and what my bill does, but it's
22 really pretty straightforward. It just says that when
23 someone goes in to vote, they have not only the choice
24 of showing their photo ID, driver's license, but we're
25 also giving them secondary choices, and those

1 secondary choices are a lot of secondary choices.

2 They could show their library card.

3 They could show any government piece of mail that was
4 mailed to them. Basically anything that would show
5 their identification as a secondary source of
6 identification is going to be allowed under my bill.
7 And when we start discussing that, I'll be glad to go
8 over the list that is listed of things. But in Texas,
9 the bill that we are laying out actually has a
10 secondary choice. Then if someone doesn't have a
11 photo ID, there is a secondary choice to identify
12 themselves.

13 I should also clarify that we are only
14 addressing the in-person voting; we are not addressing
15 mail-in ballots, early voting, any of the other things
16 in the election cycle.

17 I think I'm going to go ahead and close
18 so we can start either the questions and/or bring in
19 the witnesses. But I think it's important to note
20 that in upholding Indiana's photo ID law, in the
21 decision that was given by John Paul Stevens in his
22 majority opinion, he stated, "Confidence in the
23 integrity of our election process is essential to the
24 functioning of our participatory democracy. Voter
25 fraud drives honest citizens out of the democratic

1 process and breeds distrust of our government. Voters
2 who fear their legitimate votes will be outweighed by
3 fraudulent ones will feel disenfranchised."

4 We believe Senate Bill 362 goes a long
5 ways for correcting that concern.

6 **QUESTIONS FROM SENATE FLOOR**

7 SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you.

8 Sen. Lucio of Cameron.

9 SEN. LUCIO: Thank you, Mr. President.
10 For a question.

11 SEN. DUNCAN: Sen. Lucio.

12 SEN. LUCIO: The request was made
13 earlier today to see if we could have the Attorney
14 General here to answer any legal questions we might
15 have on this legislation. As I look around the
16 chamber, I don't see the Secretary of State, my good
17 friend Hope Andrade who I can -- well, who is the
18 Chief Elections Officer of the state, as you well
19 know. And I'm wondering if she will be present maybe
20 to respond to any questions that the members might
21 have, or the Department of Public Safety or any other
22 agency that might come into play with this piece of
23 legislation. Will that be the case?

24 SEN. FRASER: I'll address the first
25 question first. The Secretary of State, I share your

1 interest in that. And, actually, when that person
2 comes up, I have a lot of questions that I would like
3 to ask also. Unfortunately, the Secretary of State,
4 Hope Andrade, is on an airplane as we speak, out of
5 the country. But the No. 2, the Assistant Secretary
6 is here. Coby Shorter is over on the side right now
7 and will be available for any questions that would
8 come up.

9 Actually, that is one of my invited
10 persons for questions. I have him scheduled in the
11 mix. But I think any member that has a question of
12 the Secretary of State's office would be free at any
13 time for a resource.

14 The DPS, I have not personally asked
15 them to be here to testify, but I believe probably
16 they're monitoring this as we speak. And I would
17 suspect if we wanted somebody from the DPS to answer
18 questions about motor voter or any of those issue, I
19 feel sure that we could get them over. I have not
20 invited them.

21 SEN. LUCIO: Thank you.

22 Mr. Chairman, you also mentioned that
23 voter ID proposal for bipartisan and serve the public
24 interest by protecting the integrity of the ballot,
25 and you also mentioned the Commission on Federal

1 Election reform that was co-chaired by former
2 President Jimmy Carter and former Secretary of State
3 Jim Baker supported laws that required voters to show
4 a voter ID before voting.

5 I just want to ask you that, that in the
6 days after the release of the commission's report, I'm
7 informed that President Carter and former Secretary
8 Baker stated in an op ed in the New York times that
9 their intent had been misconstrued and clarified that
10 until we have universal registration, we cannot make
11 having such an ID be a condition of voting. Are you
12 aware of that op ed?

13 SEN. FRASER: Tell me, where was that?

14 SEN. LUCIO: That op ed?

15 SEN. FRASER: What was the date on that?
16 Tell me the date on that, please.

17 SEN. LUCIO: The source is Jimmy Carter
18 and James Baker III, "Voting Reform Is in the Cards,"
19 The New York Times, September 23rd -- September 23,
20 2005.

21 SEN. FRASER: And I guess I would
22 defer -- I obviously can't get in the minds -- and, by
23 the way, we do have someone from that commission here
24 that we can question, will be the second person that I
25 will call up. And so you'll have the right to ask

1 them, because they're from that commission.

2 All I can go by is a newer -- you know,
3 everyone has a right to, you know, their developing
4 thoughts. But the newest thing I have on record was
5 February 3, 2008. It was an op ed contribution, "A
6 Clearer Picture on Voter ID" by Jimmy Carter and James
7 A. Baker III, which I'm assuming -- February 3, 2008
8 is after September 23, 2005. So this would be their
9 more current thoughts.

10 And in that current editorial that I
11 have here in my hand, it said, "In 2005, we led a
12 bipartisan Commission . . ." And I'm not going to
13 read the whole thing, but it says: "We bridged a
14 partisan divide by suggesting a uniform voter photo
15 ID." And this is February 8 (sic), 2008.

16 SEN. LUCIO: 2008?

17 SEN. FRASER: 2008. Yours is 2005. So
18 I don't know what to say, other than my story is three
19 years newer than yours.

20 SEN. LUCIO: Well, I guess they changed
21 their minds after two thousand --

22 SEN. FRASER: Everybody gets to change
23 their mind. All I know is that this is the most
24 current thing that I have on file. But that was a op
25 ed contribution to the New York Times February 3,

1 2008, you know. I'm --

2 SEN. LUCIO: Thank you very much,
3 Senator.

4 SEN. FRASER: Thank you.

5 SEN. WATSON: Mr. President?

6 SEN. DUNCAN: Sen. Watson of Travis.

7 SEN. WATSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

8 I just want to ask a couple of question.

9 And first, let me say that I think you
10 and I probably agree that there is not a senator in
11 this room that doesn't want to protect the sanctity of
12 the ballot box, regardless of how they might feel
13 about 362.

14 SEN. FRASER: I would share we, without
15 a doubt -- we've had this conversation -- is that I
16 think we both have the same intent, is that neither
17 one of us want voter fraud and we would do anything we
18 could to stop voter fraud in Texas. And I think
19 that's --

20 SEN. WATSON: Nobody wants --

21 SEN. FRASER: I think we agree with
22 that.

23 SEN. WATSON: Nobody wants voter fraud.
24 And there may be some disagreements about how we go
25 about that. Let me ask a couple of questions about

1 the bill. And first let me mention something about
2 the Carter-Baker Commission. I'm not sure there was a
3 change in opinion. But what they said in that
4 February 2008 is, they were looking for a universal
5 voter identification. Is that correct?

6 SEN. FRASER: I believe the term was
7 "uniform" --

8 SEN. WATSON: Uniform.

9 SEN. FRASER: -- "voter ID." And,
10 actually, what they suggested --

11 SEN. WATSON: Was REAL ID.

12 SEN. FRASER: -- is that the federal
13 government would issue a photo ID to every person in
14 the United States.

15 SEN. WATSON: And what they've actually
16 indicated is that in order to be in favor of a uniform
17 voter ID, they believe that what needs to happen is,
18 the government would be in a position to give everyone
19 an identification so that you wouldn't run into
20 situations where there might be discrimination. Is
21 that correct?

22 Well, for example, they're affirmatively
23 said --

24 SEN. FRASER: They have affirmatively
25 said that somebody should pay for it, the federal

1 government or the states, but they would issue a photo
2 ID.

3 SEN. WATSON: So that everybody would
4 have a uniform identification?

5 SEN. FRASER: Exactly what I'm laying
6 out in this bill.

7 SEN. WATSON: And I don't disagree.

8 SEN. FRASER: I --

9 SEN. DUNCAN: Senators, senators --

10 SEN. FRASER: I can answer you. Just a
11 second.

12 SEN. DUNCAN: May I interrupt?

13 SEN. FRASER: Sure.

14 SEN. DUNCAN: You've got a court --

15 SEN. WATSON: Well, we're both
16 interrupting. Why don't you?

17 SEN. DUNCAN: Well, no. I'm just trying
18 to help you out. The court reporter can only type
19 down one person talking at a time, and so you have a
20 tendency --

21 SEN. WATSON: Fair enough.

22 SEN. DUNCAN: -- to talk over each
23 other. So if you could observe that rule, it will
24 help the record.

25 SEN. WATSON: And we do that even in

1 private conversations, I might add.

2 SEN. FRASER: Unfortunately, we are on
3 the committee together, and this is a common
4 occurrence, so we will have to try to control
5 ourselves.

6 SEN. WATSON: I think you were the last
7 one talking.

8 SEN. FRASER: The final statement, I
9 think they say -- let me read this. Actually, it's
10 interesting that the last -- this was in -- they were
11 writing this in response, urging the Supreme Court to
12 validate the Indiana law. And it says that -- they
13 are suggesting that states should move to implement
14 photo IDs gradually, that a free ID should be
15 available. But they're also saying that the Supreme
16 Court can lead the way on the voter ID issue by
17 validating the Indiana ruling, which is the photo ID.

18 And, again, it's the thing I just read.
19 It will move ". . . our national leaders and the
20 entire country to bridge the partisan divide on a
21 matter that is important to our democracy." The
22 Supreme Court should ". . . support voter ID laws that
23 make it easy to vote but tough to cheat," from their
24 editorial.

25 SEN. WATSON: And they had indicated --

1 I'm sure we'll hear some other testimony about this.
2 But the Carter-Baker Commission had indicated that
3 they believed the way Georgia had set theirs up was
4 discriminatory in part because the government wasn't,
5 as you just indicated, making it easy for people to
6 be -- all people to be able to get a uniform
7 identification.

8 SEN. FRASER: They want it to be easy
9 to -- their suggestion was have a photo ID, have
10 someone pay for it, make it easy for them to get it.
11 But they say, "Here is what we want to do. We want a
12 voter ID law that makes it easy to vote but tough to
13 cheat."

14 SEN. WATSON: Well, let's talk about
15 what the current situation is so that we can be clear
16 on what it is that we would be doing if Senate Bill
17 362 were to pass. Currently we have a form of voter
18 identification in Texas. And what it is, is we have
19 an identifying document that we call a voter
20 registration certificate. Isn't that right? The
21 state provides a voter registration certificate to
22 those who register to vote?

23 SEN. FRASER: The answer to that
24 probably is "Yes" and "No," is that the way we
25 currently identify ourselves when we go in is a voter

1 registration certificate. The problem with current
2 law is, there is no way that that person that is
3 behind the voting booth knows, "Are you really that
4 person?" because -- hold on a second -- you know,
5 there is nothing to say that I couldn't pick up my
6 brother Steve's voter ID and walk in and lay it on the
7 table and the -- we're going to ask the Secretary of
8 State this -- but I think the procedure in law says
9 identify:

10 Are you on the list? Yes.

11 Is this your correct address? Yes.

12 Are you in this precinct? Yes.

13 Here is your ballot -- even though I'm
14 voting with my brother's card.

15 SEN. WATSON: I ought to give you a flag
16 so I know when you're done. But, Senator, the point
17 is, I want to try to set what the benchmark is for
18 what is required now when someone goes in to vote.
19 And when someone goes in to vote right now, as you
20 just indicated, all they have to do is show that
21 certificate. The election officer sees their name and
22 sees that their name is on a list of registered
23 voters, and then they're able to vote. Is that
24 correct?

25 SEN. FRASER: Well, let me ask you --

1 the Secretary of State will clarify this. But if
2 you're look in Section -- is 63.001?

3 SEN. WATSON: It is.

4 SEN. FRASER: -- of the election -- and
5 if you've got it in front of you, you can read along.
6 It says bring your card, registration card, hand it to
7 them. They verify: Is the name on the card on the
8 list? Is Kirk Watson on the card? Are they also
9 listed as registered? Yes, it is. They say,

10 "Is this your current address?"

11 "Yes, it is."

12 "This is the proper precinct you're
13 going to be voting in?"

14 "Yes, it is."

15 "Here is your ID (sic)."

16 SEN. WATSON: And then you get to vote.

17 SEN. FRASER: I mean, "Here is your" --
18 can I keep going, though? The interesting thing on
19 this, though, is, Senator, that -- let me give you a
20 hypothetical -- and we'll ask the Secretary of State
21 to verify this -- is that let's assume that they
22 mailed you your voter registration to your mailbox,
23 but your next door neighbor saw them dropping it off
24 and he walked over and picked it up out of box. And
25 he beat you to the polling place. And he walked in

1 where someone didn't know who Kirk Watson was and he
2 laid it on the table, and he said, "I'm Kirk Watson,"
3 and they went through all those scenarios, that person
4 would be given a ballot and would vote for you, that
5 put it in the pile. And they would walk out the door,
6 and that vote would count in the selection. Now,
7 we'll verify with the Secretary of State that that's
8 correct, but I believe that's the way it happens right
9 now.

10 SEN. WATSON: And that really wasn't my
11 questions. So let me ask my --

12 SEN. FRASER: I'm practiced with a
13 lawyer where you don't answer the question that was
14 asked.

15 SEN. WATSON: I notice you've been
16 trying to do that. Let's just walk through what the
17 process is and the change in the law. Currently all
18 that is required is to show the certificate, walk
19 through the way you just did, and then you can vote.
20 Senate Bill 362 changes that.

21 And it says that while you would still
22 submit the voter registration certificate and that
23 part is the same, it then adds the requirement that in
24 addition to the current standard practice or procedure
25 of presenting that voter registration certificate, you

1 must also submit either a picture identification or
2 two types of other identification that's listed in
3 Senate Bill 362.

4 SEN. FRASER: Senator, I guess I would
5 ask you -- I'm assuming -- you travel a lot. You've
6 flown since 911?

7 SEN. WATSON: I'm not sure how that is
8 answering my question. Is that what your bill does or
9 doesn't do?

10 SEN. FRASER: I'm saying that this is
11 going to be a whole lot like -- even if you were
12 getting a library card, they're going to say, "We need
13 a form of photo identification, and they're going to
14 do -- like they do at the airport, they're going to
15 look at the card, they're going to look at you,
16 they're going to look back at the card and say, "Yes,
17 you are the person that you are pretending," or "you
18 say you are. You" -- Kirk Watson is the person on the
19 photo; kirk Watson is the person on the registration
20 files. And the answer is yes, that would be the way
21 this would work.

22 SEN. WATSON: So the answer is yes, that
23 there is an additional requirement so that people who
24 could vote under the current voting standard practice
25 and procedure will be precluded from voting if they

1 don't meet these new requirements. Is that correct?

2 SEN. FRASER: I'm sorry. I was talking
3 to staff. Ask that again, please.

4 SEN. WATSON: People who could vote
5 under the current voting standard practice and
6 procedure will be precluded from voting, if Senate
7 Bill 362 passes, if they don't meet those new
8 requirements?

9 SEN. FRASER: No one is going to be
10 precluded from voting. Everyone that walks in --
11 under 362, every person that walks in to vote will be
12 allowed to vote.

13 SEN. WATSON: If they meet the new
14 requirements?

15 SEN. FRASER: Every person that --

16 SEN. WATSON: That's provisional
17 balloting.

18 SEN. FRASER: -- walks in --

19 SEN. WATSON: Is that what you're
20 talking about?

21 SEN. FRASER: Every person that walks
22 into the registration to vote can vote. No one will
23 leave the voting place without being able to vote.

24 SEN. WATSON: Let me ask my question
25 differently. If they don't -- if someone walks in

1 today, under 362 -- let's say 362 passes -- and they
2 don't have the new requirements that are set forth in
3 362, they will not be able to vote a regular ballot
4 the same way people today, with just a voter
5 registration certificate, are allowed to vote a
6 regular ballot?

7 SEN. FRASER: Okay. If someone walks in
8 and -- I think right now the data is showing the last
9 year of the people that signed up, 98.5 percent of the
10 people that registered to vote had a driver's license
11 and they registered that way. So if they didn't have
12 that, if they're one of that one or two percent that
13 did not have a driver's license, they have a long
14 laundry list of things that they could use to identify
15 themselves to show that they are, in fact, who they
16 say they are. If for some reason they didn't have any
17 of that, they will be given a ballot. The ballot will
18 be marked a provisional ballot, and then we will have
19 the ability then to identify: Are they who they say
20 they are? So the answer is no, they're not going to
21 leave without being able to vote.

22 SEN. WATSON: And maybe I didn't ask my
23 question well and so you didn't understand it. My
24 question is, under 362, if they don't meet the new
25 requirements, there will be people that otherwise

1 today would be able to vote by just showing a voter
2 registration certificate that will not be able to vote
3 a regular ballot. Is that correct?

4 SEN. FRASER: Everyone leaving the
5 polling place will be able to vote.

6 SEN. WATSON: But it may be a
7 provisional ballot. Is that right?

8 SEN. FRASER: Provisional ballot,
9 though, once they verify their identification and they
10 show that they are who they say they are, the vote
11 counts. So the answer is, everyone that leaves will
12 be able to vote.

13 SEN. WATSON: Let me ask you a question
14 about the statistics you just mentioned. Do you have
15 any data regarding the racial composition of those
16 people who are currently in Texas that are without a
17 driver's license or other photo ID?

18 SEN. FRASER: Unfortunately, no, that
19 data is not, I don't think, readily available. If it
20 is, no one has given it to me. All I can go by is the
21 number -- they gave me the raw numbers of who had a
22 photo ID that was registered in, you know, the last
23 year. 2006 is the latest number. And of those, you
24 know, you had 1.5 percent of the population that
25 registered to vote that it appeared didn't have or

1 didn't offer their driver's license up as a deal. So
2 it's a very small segment, and I don't believe they
3 broke down the racial composition of that.

4 SEN. WATSON: Where did that data come
5 from?

6 SEN. FRASER: DPS, motor voter.

7 SEN. WATSON: DPS. And how many people
8 would that be?

9 SEN. FRASER: I may need to correct
10 that. I stand corrected. That came from the
11 Secretary of State's office. It was the total number
12 of people registered with a Texas driver's license.
13 I'm sorry. I stand corrected.

14 SEN. WATSON: Let me make sure I
15 understand the number that you're indicating. What
16 you're indicating is that of the total population
17 that's registered to vote, the Secretary of State's
18 office is providing data that says 98.5 percent of
19 those have a driver's license?

20 SEN. FRASER: I don't think I said that.

21 SEN. WATSON: Okay. Well, that's what
22 I'm trying to find out. I want to be clear what you
23 said.

24 SEN. FRASER: Okay. Well, let's do it
25 again. Last year, in 2006, the number of people that

1 registered to vote in 2006, that registered to vote
2 that year, of those totals, there were 2,419,188 that
3 registered with a driver's license. There were 37,490
4 that didn't use their driver's license to register.

5 SEN. WATSON: So that would not --

6 SEN. FRASER: So that --

7 SEN. WATSON: That wouldn't be taking
8 into account any long-time voters who might no longer
9 have driver's licenses or have allowed their driver's
10 license to be expired for more than two years or that
11 nature. Is that correct?

12 SEN. FRASER: I actually have that data,
13 too.

14 SEN. WATSON: Good. Why don't you give
15 that to me.

16 SEN. FRASER: Total number of people on
17 their staff -- now, have to keep in mind that some of
18 these people that have been on the rolls for 30, 40,
19 50, 60 years, some of this has changed. And so some
20 of them that signed up, once they were okayed and
21 identified, they stayed on the roll and they didn't
22 have to add it.

23 My mother would be a good example, but
24 she didn't get her driver's license until well into
25 her married life. On her registration form, she is

1 not registered as showing to have a photo ID; but, in
2 fact, I do know that she has one. The ones in the
3 records that show that, they show that there were
4 5,601,000 that have a license. The ones that neither
5 numbers show up, either social security number or
6 voter ID, 809,000. So in their records, it's about
7 88 percent of the people, in their records, give the
8 driver's license as their identification source.
9 There's 12 percent they don't know about. But in
10 that, the assumption is, a great many of those now
11 have a photo ID, people like my mother.

12 SEN. WATSON: But we don't know what
13 that number is?

14 SEN. FRASER: We don't know for sure.

15 SEN. WATSON: And how many people are we
16 talking about when we talk about 12 percent?

17 SEN. FRASER: Well, in the records, they
18 have 809,041 that they don't have in their records a
19 number registered, but they also readily will admit
20 that those records are very outdated because what
21 happens when someone is registered, as soon as they're
22 approved as a registered voter, they don't ever have
23 do go through this again. So --

24 SEN. WATSON: Right.

25 SEN. FRASER: You can't automatically

1 make the assumption that there's 809,000 people that
2 don't have it. I think the belief -- probably one of
3 the things that we may be having a lot of these
4 questions you're asking that could be answered by
5 other states. Georgia has a very close makeup of the
6 way our population is made up. Indiana is a little
7 different. But in those cases -- I think the
8 registrar of both of those states are going to be
9 here, and they're going to tell you they went through
10 the cycle and identified the ones that didn't have it.
11 And I believe they're going to tell you they were
12 shocked at how few people didn't have a photo ID.

13 SEN. WATSON: Well, one of the things
14 that I think we need to be concerned about before we
15 vote on this floor is whether or not, when the changes
16 that you propose get made, whether or not that's going
17 to have a negative impact on certain populations. And
18 the 12 percent that you're talking about there, the
19 800,000 to a --

20 SEN. FRASER: The unknown category.

21 SEN. WATSON: The 800,000 to a million
22 people, do we know what the racial breakdown is of
23 that? Do you know how many African-Americans, how
24 many Hispanics, those that speak only Spanish?

25 SEN. FRASER: I'm not advised, because I

1 don't -- at least I don't remember on the -- I can't
2 remember on either the driver's license and/or the
3 voter that it had a place in there to click, you know,
4 Anglos.

5 SEN. WATSON: Are you familiar,
6 Senator, with any statistical analysis that's been
7 done regarding the potential effect of Senate Bill
8 362's new requirements on African-Americans?

9 SEN. FRASER: A lot of what I'm at least
10 observing, you will hear today from Indiana and
11 Georgia, two states that implemented it. And they're
12 going to talk about the people that voted in the
13 racial breakdown before they implemented it and after
14 they implemented it and what happened in --

15 SEN. WATSON: Again, I would --

16 SEN. FRASER: So I think -- what I'm
17 hoping to do is have facts speak for themselves.

18 SEN. WATSON: Well, and I'm looking
19 forward to that. I'm saying you, though, with regard
20 to your bill, Senate Bill 362, are you familiar with
21 any data or study that's been done with regard to some
22 sort of statistical analysis concerning the effect of
23 the new requirements of Senate Bill 362 on -- and I'll
24 just mention a couple of populations -- African-
25 American population, Hispanic, people making less than

1 \$35,000 a year, people who speak only Spanish, any
2 statistical analysis of the effect of these new
3 requirements on those people?

4 SEN. FRASER: Well, I guess the
5 assumption would be, the people in Texas, even though
6 we're independent, we're also a whole lot like the
7 people in the rest the nation. Those statistics are
8 available nationwide, because we already have this
9 being implemented other places. We're going to have
10 witnesses that are going to testify to that. And I
11 think you're asking a subjective question that we have
12 objective data that is available that the witnesses
13 are going to lay out. You're asking have I done that?
14 The answer is no, but I am pulling data from the
15 academics that have done that and have delivered back.

16 SEN. WATSON: As it applies to Texas?

17 SEN. FRASER: Well, you assume it would
18 apply to Texas, if they're citizens of the United
19 States. And, you know, I don't know why it wouldn't
20 apply.

21 SEN. WATSON: Well, so that I'm clear,
22 what we can expect to hear is data related to states
23 other than Texas. But you're not familiar with any
24 statistical analysis that's been done regarding the
25 impacts or effects of the new requirements of Senate

1 Bill 362 on minority populations in the State of
2 Texas?

3 SEN. FRASER: Actually, Senator, you're
4 going to hear some testimony from some people from the
5 major cities in Texas and things that have happened
6 and what, you know, possibly they believe. But I
7 don't know that I can answer your question.

8 SEN. WATSON: All right. Fair enough.
9 Let me ask a quick question about funding under this.
10 Can you point me in this bill, Senate Bill 362, where
11 there is any provision to educate voters about this
12 change requirement for more identification?

13 SEN. FRASER: Do you see the section
14 that says "Education" --

15 SEN. WATSON: Yes, I do.

16 SEN. FRASER: -- "Voted Education"?

17 SEN. WATSON: And tell me -- what that
18 says is that the Secretary of State and voter
19 registrars are going to put it on their website. Is
20 that correct?

21 SEN. FRASER: Yes.

22 SEN. WATSON: Is that the only education
23 that's identified in this bill?

24 SEN. FRASER: We are anticipating a --
25 you know, we're going to have to educate not only the

1 registrars, the poll workers, we're going to have
2 posting outside of the voting place of the
3 requirements of this. I would assume one of the
4 things that you're going to ask is, in Ohio and
5 Georgia, both that they had mailers to the voters
6 talking about these changes. Obviously, the specifics
7 of that are not included in this bill. But as a
8 member of the Senate and assuming this bill passes,
9 that I think I am assuming everyone in this body would
10 be sympathetic, that we should include some funding to
11 make sure that voters are educated.

12 SEN. WATSON: So you anticipate that
13 there would be some fiscal note to this bill?

14 SEN. FRASER: Well, no. This bill only
15 has -- it has no fiscal implications.

16 SEN. WATSON: And that's because there's
17 no money put into it for any of the things you just
18 talked about in terms of educating voters?

19 SEN. FRASER: And again, if there was
20 education, obviously, the education, depending on how
21 much education it was, there could either be no fiscal
22 impact or it could be some. Again, you're being
23 subjective.

24 SEN. WATSON: All right. I'm not sure
25 that's the case, but let me make sure I'm clear.

1 Under the current bill, there's not any ability to
2 educate the voters about these new requirements, other
3 than that it would be posted on the Secretary of
4 State's or a county voter registrar's website?

5 SEN. FRASER: We would -- actually --
6 let me ask a question of staff.

7 (Brief pause)

8 I think the question you're asking is
9 that every time a registration card is sent out, there
10 will be an explanation with that registration card,
11 which I'm assuming you're calling the education part
12 of that. So the answer is yes, there will be an
13 education go out when the registration cards are- sent
14 out. So a person's --

15 SEN. WATSON: So if somebody registers
16 newly, they'll get that information?

17 SEN. FRASER: I get a registration card
18 every two years.

19 SEN. WATSON: So every time that -- what
20 you're suggesting is, that's going to be -- the
21 substance and sum of the education will be on new
22 registration cards?

23 SEN. FRASER: And, quite frankly, you're
24 getting into an area of the technical part of the way
25 this would be administered by the election division.

1 In the bill we do specify that when a registration
2 card is sent out. All I know is, I get one every two
3 years, I get a new registration card. It couldn't be
4 real difficult in that to include an explanation of
5 this bill, what will be included, and make sure that
6 they understand that whenever they show up at the
7 polls, you need to do this.

8 So the answer of -- the language of the
9 bill says that is anticipated. Now, the actual agency
10 itself that administers, the Secretary of State's
11 office, I think probably would be the one to answer
12 that question.

13 SEN. WATSON: And we don't know -- you
14 don't know, as we stand here today, how much that
15 costs?

16 SEN. FRASER: What it will cost? Well,
17 right now we have given them funds to send out that
18 registration card. And if all they're doing is
19 putting another piece of paper in that registration
20 card, I just can't imagine that they can't take care
21 of it out of their regular budget.

22 So I think where you're trying to go --
23 will there be an appropriation for that? -- I don't
24 anticipate that that's necessary. But you're a member
25 of this body. And if you want to recommend that,

1 after this bill passes, that if you want to offer up
2 to the Appropriation Committee and talk to Chairman
3 Ogden, I think you have every right to do that. I
4 can't speak for the Secretary of State the way this
5 will be administered.

6 SEN. WATSON: Well, I'm just accustomed
7 to when bills come into committee, we tend to know or
8 are supposed to know what the fiscal note is at that
9 time so that we don't vote on something, only to later
10 have a new fiscal note come in.

11 SEN. FRASER: Did you get a copy of the
12 fiscal note?

13 SEN. WATSON: Yes, and it said zero.

14 SEN. FRASER: There is your answer.

15 SEN. WATSON: Well, and what that means
16 is, there's going to be little education, and we'll
17 talk about -- Chairman Duncan has made a good point,
18 that the court reporter has now been going -- and
19 while you and I may be enjoying our repartee, she
20 probably needs a break.

21 So with the Chair's permission and with
22 Sen. Fraser's permission, I'll be more than happy to
23 yield the floor for the time being so that we can take
24 a break for the court reporter.

25 SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Sen. Watson.

1 And, members, we'll stand at ease for 10 minutes.

2 We'll go back in at exactly 2:50.

3 (Recess: 2:42 p.m. to 2:56 p.m.)

4 SEN. DUNCAN: The Committee of the Whole
5 will come back to order.

6 Sen. Watson.

7 SEN. WATSON: Mr. Chairman, I'll yield
8 for other staff's questions, so we can move forward.

9 SEN. DUNCAN: All right.

10 Sen. Shapleigh.

11 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

12 If I may, some questions of the author.

13 SEN. FRASER: I would love to answer
14 questions.

15 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Senator, you, in laying
16 out your basis for filing this bill, talked
17 extensively about the Carter and Baker Commission. Do
18 you remember the year that commission -- when they
19 issued their report?

20 SEN. FRASER: Senator, there is a
21 reference in the forward to the report that I believe
22 says 2005. And I'm assuming the Commission was formed
23 that year, and I'm assuming they also issued the
24 report. But I'm also going to punt on that one,
25 because we have someone from the Carter-Baker

1 Commission that is here, that if we can get past these
2 questions and get to our witnesses, I've got people
3 that can answer that question a lot better.

4 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Okay. You quoted from
5 their words in an op ed article. And what I would
6 like to do is give you a copy of an op ed article that
7 they put in The New York Times one week after issuing
8 the report, so that we can talk about what their
9 intent or what they thought about this report. You
10 have their -- what we just pulled off what Sen. McCain
11 would call the Google, an editorial from Jimmy Carter
12 and James Baker themselves dated September 23, 2005,
13 which was the week after they produced this report.
14 And I would like you to, if you would, see if I'm
15 reading this correctly.

16 "This week, we issued a report that
17 bridges the gap between the two parties' perspectives
18 and offers a comprehensive approach that can help end
19 the sterile debate between ballot access ballot
20 integrity. Unfortunately, some have misrepresented
21 one of our 87 recommendations. As a result, they have
22 deflected attention from the need for comprehensive
23 reform."

24 "Since we presented our work to the
25 president and Congress, some have overlooked almost

1 all of the report to focus on a single proposal - a
2 requirement that voters have driver's licenses or
3 government-issued photo IDs. Worse, they have
4 unfairly described our recommendation.

5 "Here's the problem we were addressing:
6 24 states already require that voters prove their
7 identity at the poll - some states request driver's
8 licenses, others accept utility bills, affidavits or
9 other documents - and 12 others are considering it.
10 This includes Georgia, which just started demanding
11 that voters have a state-issued photo ID, even though
12 obtaining one can be too costly or difficult for poor
13 Georgians. We consider Georgia's law discriminatory."

14 Are these the same guys that issued the
15 report that you're relying on?

16 SEN. FRASER: And I guess I would remind
17 you that the Georgia law, they're a Section 5 voter
18 rights state, and they were approved. As of
19 February 8, 2008 of this year, I believe they were --
20 that final appeal was -- you know, they ruled with
21 Georgia. And Georgia's act -- both was approved
22 through DOJ, approved through Section 5 and was
23 approved through the courts.

24 Again, I don't -- all the things that
25 you're asking, you address several different issues

1 that we have witnesses here that actually know the
2 details of this. You're asking me, from 2005, to get
3 in either President Carter or James Baker or staff or
4 the other 21 members on the commission, what was in
5 their head then and what was in their head in 2008
6 when they released the article to The New York Times,
7 the guest editorial. I think those would be better
8 answered by our witness that is here that is sitting
9 in the back waiting to testify. We also have Indiana,
10 and we've got those Georgia people. There's two from
11 Georgia that will tell you how this impacted their
12 voters, including minorities.

13 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Let's go if we can --
14 do you have the fiscal note on this bill, the one that
15 came with our packet? I'm looking at the last
16 paragraph that describes the costs in this bill and
17 what the anticipated fiscal note might be.

18 SEN. FRASER: I've got it. What are you
19 referring to?

20 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Well, when you look at
21 the top, it says "No fiscal impact implication to the
22 state is anticipated." Is that correct?

23 SEN. FRASER: That is correct.

24 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: And when we look at the
25 bottom, after it describes putting up a website which

1 would be part of the state's obligation, then at the
2 bottom it says, "Based on responses from a sampling of
3 election authorities and county clerks, fiscal impact
4 from implementing provisions of the bill would vary by
5 county. Costs would include at a minimum those for
6 printing signs to post at each polling place, which
7 would not be significant. Other potential costs would
8 be associated with additional training and posting
9 information to the county website. Again, those costs
10 are not expected to be significant. One smaller
11 county response anticipates that the new provisions
12 regarding casting a provisional ballot would require
13 hiring additional staff, resulting in a moderate to
14 significant cost."

15 Now, my question is, where is the
16 training going to be done? Who will do the training
17 with respect to those that will administer and enforce
18 the rules that you propose to pass today?

19 SEN. FRASER: And I will tell you again
20 that we have an expert resource witness that can
21 answer that question, that if we can get on with the
22 testimony, that the persons we have here I think are
23 prepared to answer that question.

24 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: But as the author of
25 the bill -- and your intent is important in

1 establishing this -- in this fiscal note, there is no
2 money for training at the state level, that in this
3 fiscal note it's contemplated that locals in a broad
4 verify of the polling places around the state would be
5 responsible for the training under this bill. Is that
6 correct?

7 SEN. FRASER: My intent of this bill is
8 to establish a system of voter identification to try
9 to eliminate fraudulent voting and would be
10 implemented by the Secretary of State. The fiscal
11 note to the bill is like we always do on every piece
12 of legislation. It is sent back in. And the fiscal
13 note, as delivered back to the members of the
14 Legislature, it says there is -- no significant fiscal
15 implication to the state is anticipated.

16 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Okay. Well, let's get
17 down, if we may, to a "Yes" or "No" answer. The
18 fiscal note on your bill says, "Each county clerk
19 would be required to provide a session of training
20 using the standards adopted by and the materials
21 developed by the Secretary of State as soon as
22 practicable as well." Is that your intent under the
23 bill that you drafted?

24 SEN. FRASER: I guess I would refer you
25 back to the bill itself. We've got the training

1 section, the wording of the bill. If you would
2 like -- I'll read it to you if you would like for me
3 to. But the wording of the bill is the instruction to
4 the Secretary of the State and the counties. And then
5 the Secretary of State would be -- I think it's their
6 job to implement. But, again, the expert witness can
7 answer that.

8 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: In your opening, in
9 talking about the need for this bill, you referred to
10 Cooke County, you referred to LBJ and Duval County.
11 Are you aware of and do you personally know Royal
12 Masset?

13 SEN. FRASER: And I guess I would ask
14 what Royal Masset has to do with Cooke County?

15 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Well, nothing. But
16 your examples came from other places to lay the basis
17 for the need for this bill. And my question is, do
18 you know, were you aware that Royal Masset was the
19 political director of the Republican Party for 15
20 years?

21 SEN. FRASER: Well, I guess the fact
22 that I recognize that his name is Royal "Ma-say"
23 rather than Royal "Mas-et" would give some indication
24 that I know Royal "Ma-say."

25 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: So if Royal "Mas-et" in

1 something that was posted on line last time this bill
2 came up, who was the political director of the
3 Republican Party, if he were to say, "Anyone who says
4 all legal voters under this bill can vote," doesn't
5 know what he was talking about and, "Anyone who says
6 that a lack of IDs won't discriminate against
7 otherwise legal minority votes" is lying, do you have
8 any way -- do you have any way of determining why he
9 would say that?

10 SEN. FRASER: I have no input.

11 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: If Royal Masset were
12 quoted in this account as saying, "In my involvement
13 with over 5,000 Republican candidates, I have never
14 seen one case of Republicans committing voter fraud,"
15 do you have any idea why he would say that?

16 SEN. FRASER: I am not advised.

17 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: If Royal Masset said in
18 his quote, "When voting in America is only allowed to
19 healthy and wealthy people than (sic) the America I
20 know is far sicker than my mother. House Bill 218" --
21 which is the bill that came up last session, identical
22 I believe to the bill that you're carrying -- "is a
23 direct descendent of poll taxes, and of allowing only
24 white male property owners to vote. In its effect it
25 is racist, barbaric, antidemocratic and contrary to

1 everything that made America great."

2 Do you have any idea why a former
3 political director of the Republican Party would make
4 that statement?

5 SEN. FRASER: No other advice other than
6 to say that the three sources that I quoted in my
7 opening remarks, two were Democrats and one was a
8 left-leaning Supreme Court Justice that all make, you
9 know, comments the other direction. And, actually,
10 Rep. Steve Wolens commented about the fraud and the
11 voter harvesting that happened in a Democratic
12 primary. So I'm assuming people on both sides of this
13 issue have opinions.

14 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Now, I think -- I
15 thought I heard you mention the name Karl Rove as
16 one --

17 SEN. FRASER: I don't think I mentioned
18 Karl Rove.

19 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Okay. Let me ask, are
20 you personally, other than the hearsay statements from
21 Steve Wolens and others, are you personally
22 acquainted, do you know of any voter fraud, you
23 yourself?

24 SEN. FRASER: Well, the hearsay
25 statements, those were actually statements by Steve

1 Wolens he made -- I think he made those on the House
2 Floor in laying out his bill, so I don't think those
3 are hearsay. He represented them as facts.

4 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: In connection with your
5 investigation and your desire to pass this bill, did
6 you talk to the Attorney General of the State of
7 Texas?

8 SEN. FRASER: Ask that question again.

9 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: In your investigation
10 of this bill as you worked it up, did you consult with
11 the Attorney General of the State of Texas?

12 SEN. FRASER: I guess I need a clear
13 question. You know, what -- "consult" is a very broad
14 lawyer term.

15 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Did you talk to him?
16 Did you ask him about voter fraud?

17 SEN. FRASER: I talk to the Attorney
18 General quite often on a full range of issues.

19 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Did you talk to him
20 about this issue?

21 SEN. FRASER: I have talked to the
22 Attorney General about a wide range of issues.

23 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Did you talk to him
24 about voter fraud and the nature, scope and extent of
25 it here in Texas?

1 SEN. FRASER: No.

2 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Okay. Were you aware
3 that he did a rather extensive investigation searching
4 for voter fraud in Texas and spent approximately
5 \$1.4 million on that investigation?

6 SEN. FRASER: I guess I would dispute
7 the statement that you just made, is that the
8 Secretary of State was giving an appropriation of
9 \$1.4 million that they used in the special
10 investigation, unit investigation. Within that
11 \$1.4 million, it came from federal funds that were
12 spent on election fraud. The issues they used that on
13 was the Eldorado YZF Ranch case, the Texas Youth
14 Commission, the hurricane-related rapid response
15 efforts, the market manipulation and penny stock fraud
16 case, the ERCOT case, the cyber case, (inaudible)
17 unit, identity theft, public corruption, money
18 laundering and election fraud.

19 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Okay. So I'm looking
20 at Attorney General Greg Abbott's press release from
21 March of 2006 where he announces, "In Texas, an
22 epidemic of voter fraud is harming the electoral
23 process and it's time we rooted it out." Do you
24 recall when he launched that investigation?

25 SEN. FRASER: I do.

1 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: And reading further in
2 his press release, "At first glance, these might seem
3 to be like isolated events in far-flung towns. Step
4 back and the picture looks just as sinister as it did
5 60 years ago. For example, Texas has long been a
6 haven for paid political operatives who target seniors
7 and the disabled to handle their mail-in ballots for
8 them. Many of the cases referred to my office by the
9 Secretary of State fall into this category."

10 Do you remember that press release?

11 SEN. FRASER: And I think you're going
12 back and addressing the case of the Steve Wolens' bill
13 that he filed on the mail-in ballots, and I don't
14 think that particular issue has anything to do with
15 Senate Bill 362. My bill relates to the voter
16 identification issue when we're investigating --

17 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Well, I --

18 SEN. FRASER: I make reference to the
19 Wolens bill because it is part of the fraud history
20 and voter fraud. But the investigation you're talking
21 about has nothing to do with the bill we're laying out
22 right now.

23 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Well, here is his press
24 release. Here is the title of it: "Helping Stamp Out
25 Voter Fraud in Texas." That's exactly what you're

1 bringing forward today. Right? Is that what you're
2 trying to address in your bill?

3 SEN. FRASER: Could we get a copy of
4 that? You're referencing something. We're looking
5 through. And for some reason -- is all the
6 information we have. For some reason I can't find
7 that one. We thought we had them all. But I'm sorry.
8 I don't have that one.

9 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Okay. This is his
10 press release off of the website when he launched his
11 investigation in March of 2006.

12 SEN. FRASER: And, Senator, out of
13 fairness, I don't regularly go to the Attorney
14 General's website to read every press release that
15 comes out. So I'm sorry, I don't --

16 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: I understand. But
17 you're bringing a bill and you led this Senate to
18 believe and you're laying out the case for widespread
19 voter fraud in the State of Texas. And we've had, to
20 my knowledge in the last two years, one major
21 investigation by the Attorney General of the State of
22 Texas. And I want to get into exactly what that
23 widespread voter fraud looks like after that
24 investigation. That's where I'm going. That's what I
25 want to find out.

1 So in this press release, he's laying
2 out the basis for widespread voter fraud, and he
3 launched -- his investigation spans, as you say, among
4 other things -- investigating other issues,
5 \$1.4 million. And by my account here, that
6 investigation produced exactly 13 indictments. Twelve
7 of the 13 were minorities; nine, Hispanics; three,
8 African-Americans. Thirteen of 13 of the indictments
9 were Democrats. Now, do you have any reason to
10 dispute those numbers with us here today?

11 SEN. FRASER: Yes, I do. The exact
12 numbers are 30 suspects, 22 that have already been
13 prosecuted.

14 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: In terms of the
15 indictments, when he brought the indictments --

16 SEN. FRASER: Indictments on 30
17 suspects.

18 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: How many of those were
19 minority?

20 SEN. FRASER: I'm not advised.

21 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: How many of those were
22 Democrats?

23 SEN. FRASER: I'm not advised. I don't
24 know that they asked him what their --

25 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Well, do you have any

1 witness here today who can confirm how many of those
2 were minorities and how many were Democrats?

3 SEN. FRASER: I have not called a
4 witness, you know, for that. It's possible that -- we
5 have two people from the registrar's office in
6 Houston, and I know Houston was one of the places that
7 had a problem. And I would suggest that you ask the
8 expert witness from the Houston registrar's office. I
9 suspect they probably would have some information.

10 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Well, I think this
11 issue of that investigation is the proof that we have
12 of how widespread fraud is in the State of Texas. I
13 think we have a perfect right to ask those questions.
14 And I want to know if you as a chairman will
15 participate with us in getting a live witness that we
16 can ask about those cases on this floor?

17 SEN. FRASER: And I'm being advised --
18 let me just confirm.

19 (Brief pause)

20 I'm being advised that the Attorney
21 General's office is willing to answer your question,
22 to clarify the questions you have.

23 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: And will that Attorney
24 General bring us, with time to review the file on each
25 of these 13 indictments so that we can determine for

1 ourselves and can effectively cross-examine him or her
2 on the real nature of these cases? Will we have that
3 file in time to really do the job we need to do to get
4 at the heart of this massive voter fraud that we have
5 in the State of Texas?

6 SEN. FRASER: You know, I don't think
7 that the indictments on those -- we're in a case that
8 the ability to game the system by representing
9 yourself as someone else. I've got one area of the
10 voter fraud in this that we're addressing, and it is
11 voter ID, identifying that when you walk in for
12 in-person voting, you are who you say you are.

13 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: In connection with the
14 indictments brought, even your number, which differs
15 from my number, did a single one, would a single
16 indictment have been resolved by this photo ID or were
17 they all mail-in ballots or other issues?

18 SEN. FRASER: I am not advised. My goal
19 on this is to look at the law itself, of implementing,
20 people identifying themselves for the ability to vote.
21 We were looking at the Indiana law that is a strict
22 photo ID, the Georgia law that is a strict photo ID
23 that have been in place, Indiana for two election
24 cycles, Georgia for the last. And we're going to hear
25 from expert witnesses of how that not only didn't

1 suppress voting, it actually increased voting because
2 it increased voter confidence.

3 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: So are you aware of any
4 other investigations, other than what Attorney General
5 Abbott has done here in Texas, with respect to voter
6 fraud?

7 SEN. FRASER: I'm not advised.

8 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: So if we hear from this
9 witness that's going to come here and share with us
10 the nature and extent of voter fraud in the State of
11 Texas, and not a single one relates to photo ID, will
12 that make a difference in the way you prosecute this
13 bill?

14 SEN. FRASER: Again, we're going to have
15 the expert witnesses come forward. But I think what
16 you're going to hear is the case -- or the example
17 that I used with Sen. Watson of someone stealing his
18 identification, going and voting and, you know,
19 representing himself as Kirk Watson and being able to
20 vote.

21 I think what you're going to hear -- and
22 I don't want to put words in the mouth of the
23 Secretary of State or the other witnesses -- but I
24 think you're going to find that it is extremely hard
25 to identify and even harder to prosecute those cases,

1 because we have a huge flaw in Texas law. We have not
2 given them the ability to even identify that someone
3 is breaking the law. And if you can't identify
4 they're breaking the law, then prosecuting that person
5 becomes even harder. So I think the point that's
6 going to be made through the testimony on this is that
7 we have a huge deficiency in current law in
8 identifying voters when they come for in-person
9 voting.

10 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: You had mentioned and
11 laid out some statistics on those that have photo IDs
12 in the State of Texas and said that your information
13 came from the DPS. Is that correct?

14 SEN. FRASER: I don't think I
15 represented anything came from DPS. I think the data
16 we had I represented came from the Secretary of State.

17 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Okay. Are you aware of
18 any other data from Texas with respect to those that
19 hold photo IDs that are of voting age?

20 SEN. FRASER: Help me with that. I --

21 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Well, for example, are
22 you aware of, say, the Texas Conservative Research
23 Institute's finding -- the Texas Conservative
24 Coalition Research Institute finding that 37 percent
25 of Texas residents over the age of 80 do not have a

1 driver's license?

2 (Brief pause)

3 SEN. FRASER: I'm not advised. And I
4 don't think, unless they called every one of those
5 people, they could verify that. My mother is over 80
6 and she still has a driver's license, I believe, but
7 she votes by mail.

8 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: So which is the number,
9 the number that the Texas Conservative Coalition
10 Research Institute has for us, 37 percent don't have a
11 driver's license, or the number that you're bringing
12 to us?

13 SEN. FRASER: I don't think I brought
14 anything forward.

15 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Okay. Thank you,
16 Senator. I look forward to another --

17 SEN. FRASER: You're cutting me short.
18 You told me that I would be here till midnight on your
19 questionings.

20 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: We've still got eight
21 hours.

22 SEN. FRASER: That's enough time.

23 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: We're ready.

24 SEN. FRASER: Thank you.

25 SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Thank you.

1 SEN. DUNCAN: Sen. Zaffirini.

2 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: Thank you,
3 Mr. President.

4 SEN. FRASER: Is this a test to see if I
5 really have this information in the books?

6 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: Yes, it is. I'm going
7 to ask you questions about Page 218, Line 4, and what
8 it's on.

9 SEN. FRASER: The book that I shared
10 with you --

11 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: Yes.

12 SEN. FRASER: -- and showed you all my
13 data.

14 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: It's a wonderful book,
15 and I congratulate you and your staff for developing
16 such thorough information, very impressive. My staff
17 is not happy to know about it, however.

18 Sen. Fraser, you were the Senate sponsor
19 of House Bill 218 that never made it to the Senate
20 floor in 2007. Correct?

21 SEN. FRASER: That is correct. I was
22 the sponsor of the --

23 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: Do you know the main
24 differences, if any, between the bill that you
25 sponsored in 2007 and the bill that we are considering

1 today regarding voter ID?

2 SEN. FRASER: I'm going to clarify with
3 staff. I think I know the answer, but . . .

4 (Brief pause)

5 I'm being advised that the bill that
6 we're filing is very, very close. There are very,
7 very small changes in the bill.

8 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: Well, that's what I
9 thought. I looked at the two bills and I looked at
10 the two bill analyses and I looked at the two fiscal
11 notes. But what surprised me more than anything is
12 that the bill that we considered in 2007 had a fiscal
13 note of \$671,000 in each year over a five-year period,
14 but the fiscal note for the bill that we are
15 considering today says "No Fiscal Implications."
16 Could you explain the difference in the fiscal note?

17 SEN. FRASER: Good research. And it's
18 exactly the same thing that I -- I looked at the two.
19 I asked the same question. We called about the fiscal
20 note. Evidently in the research of this -- and again,
21 we've got an expert witness that is sitting -- or they
22 were sitting right over here, the Secretary of State.
23 I think they will answer that. And I think the answer
24 is, again, I don't want to put words in their mouth,
25 but I think in doing more research, they found out

1 that a lot of these things are available for them to
2 do within their current budget, and it does not create
3 additional expense.

4 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: Well, I certainly do
5 want to follow up with the LBB to ask them
6 specifically, since they write the fiscal notes, why
7 such an enormous difference. It's just amazing. I
8 would like the name of the person who developed the
9 new fiscal note. I might want to work with that
10 person for my bills.

11 SEN. FRASER: Well, as thorough as you
12 are on finance, because I've sat there and watched
13 you, and you do a wonderful job in looking at these.
14 And I know exactly the questions you'll be asking in
15 Finance, and I would encourage you to do that. But I
16 also, being a former member of Finance, did the same
17 thing, asked the questions. And my response back was,
18 is that after further examination, they realized that
19 this had no fiscal impact.

20 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: I'll be asking them to
21 look at some of mine further and see what they can
22 come up with.

23 SEN. FRASER: Thank you, Senator.

24 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: Thank you, Senator, for
25 that particular answer. But looking at the bill --

1 and Senators Watson and Shapleigh touched upon these
2 issues -- there will be some costs to the local
3 officials, will there not -- the posting of signs, the
4 training will be provided by the state, but the local
5 officials will have to engage in a lot of
6 verification, participate in that training, the
7 posting of signs and development of material, or will
8 the state cover that expense?

9 SEN. FRASER: I expect that is; correct,
10 is that, you know. But that also is not unusual in
11 that the local elected officials, any time there is
12 something for notification, they do that. And so it's
13 not -- I'm being told not unusual, wouldn't be
14 expected.

15 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: There was much
16 discussion yesterday and today and even before that,
17 including by Sen. Duncan and Sen. Van de Putte,
18 Sen. West and others regarding the need for each side
19 to make a record, and then each side, those who
20 support this legislation and those who oppose it are
21 making a record for two purposes: No. 1, because a
22 lawsuit is expected; No. 2, because we will be dealing
23 with challenges before the Department of Justice.
24 Would you agree with that?

25 SEN. FRASER: You know, again, you're

1 projecting some what-ifs.

2 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: I thought it --

3 SEN. FRASER: I would suggest that my
4 intention today is not to make a record. I'm not in
5 any way trying to develop any kind of record, other
6 than trying to inform my fellow other 30 senators that
7 the bill that I'm laying out will increase voter
8 participation rather than the people that believe that
9 their vote is not going to count.

10 And so the expert witnesses that I have
11 brought today are the Secretary of State to talk about
12 the fact that we've got a problem, the Houston
13 registrar that says that they've had a problem there
14 in voter fraud. We've got people from Indiana to talk
15 about the fact that after we implemented this law,
16 they had the largest increase in Democratic votes in
17 the nation. We've got two people from Georgia that
18 are going to say that they had a huge increase in
19 voter participation, and they're going to talk about
20 the minority increases, because, evidently, Georgia
21 had a huge increase because the Hispanic and the
22 African-American voters were encouraged that their
23 vote was, in fact, going to count.

24 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: But what years are you
25 comparing, a huge increase from what year to what

1 year?

2 SEN. FRASER: You and I have been in
3 politics a long time, and we know that presidential
4 year elections are the comparison. So if you're
5 comparing 2008, you would look at 2004. If you look
6 at 2006, you would look at 2002. In Indiana after the
7 bill was implemented, if you compare 2002 to 2006,
8 after it went into place, there was a two percent
9 increase in the voter participation. All of it came
10 in democratic voters. There were three new
11 congressional people elected in Indiana in 2006.

12 In 2008, during that same election
13 cycle, the vote total in Indiana was over double the
14 increase of next door Illinois. They had a 6.7
15 percent increase in all voting. It all came in the
16 Democrat election. They had 6.9 percent in Indiana
17 increase, even though Republican voting actually
18 stayed stable or went down a little bit.

19 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: Well, we looked at the
20 data, but we would disagree on the interpretation of
21 the data because we, the Democrats, believe that that
22 was the impact of President Obama, and that it was
23 President Obama who brought out the African-Americans
24 and the Hispanics and the minorities and that he was
25 the motivation and the reason that there was such an

1 increase in turnout.

2 SEN. FRASER: I'm glad you brought that
3 up, because the good thing is, we got Indiana here to
4 verify that. But I think they're going to tell you
5 that Obama was from Illinois. He was a senator from
6 his home state next door where we had this
7 repressive -- or the alleged oppressive voter ID bill
8 that was put in place. The increase in Indiana was
9 more than double the increase in Illinois, which was
10 the president-elect's home state that he was serving
11 in.

12 I believe the facts are going to show
13 just the obvious. Not only did they not depress
14 voting, those voters were encouraged that their votes
15 were going to count, and it doubled in Indiana over
16 what it was in Illinois. So I would love for you to
17 make that case, because I think it's going to show
18 that just the opposite happened. I think they were
19 encouraged to vote and they voted in great numbers.

20 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: And perhaps if the
21 voter ID hadn't been in place, the turnout would have
22 tripled or quadrupled. So we don't know that, but we
23 will look into it and pursue those issues with the
24 expert voters. Thank you, Senator.

25 SEN. FRASER: All right.

1 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: Now, going back to the
2 cost of this particular legislation, have you
3 considered at all the cost to the State of Texas to
4 participate in a lawsuit, to defend a lawsuit related
5 to this particular bill if it passes?

6 SEN. FRASER: No. And I have -- the
7 answer is no. As you know, it's part of the
8 legislative process.

9 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: Yes.

10 SEN. FRASER: Any time the State of
11 Texas is litigated against, we have an obligation to
12 defend ourselves. And, as you know, since you've been
13 in the Legislature -- you have been here a long time
14 and you've seen it multiple times -- and if the
15 lawsuit is filed, then the state has to defend itself.

16 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: Have you considered at
17 all the cost to the State of Texas to dealing with the
18 challenge that would be issued with the Department of
19 Justice regarding this particular legislation if it
20 passes?

21 SEN. FRASER: I guess the question I
22 would ask you, if you're asking me if I've looked at
23 the cost, I would ask you the question, have you
24 looked at if someone lost an election because someone
25 cheated, because they misrepresented themselves and they

1 weren't allowed to serve -- and one of the things
2 we're going to be talking about is, there is somebody
3 in this room today that won a very narrow election and
4 would not be here today if someone had cheated on a
5 very few votes.

6 So I guess the question I'll ask you,
7 what is the cost of the State of Texas if someone is
8 allowed to cheat, that would change history, someone
9 else to represent them, there is a huge cost to the
10 state in the fact that you change history by rigging
11 an election.

12 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: But basically what
13 we're focusing on at this point in the debate is the
14 cost related to this particular bill, not to history
15 and not to the future but the costs associated with
16 this particular bill. On a related note, were any of
17 your expert witnesses brought in at any expense to the
18 State of Texas or the Senate in particular?

19 SEN. FRASER: I'm sorry. I've got two
20 people asking questions. Please ask it again.

21 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: Were any of your expert
22 witnesses for today brought in at the expense of the
23 State of Texas or the Senate in particular?

24 SEN. FRASER: No.

25 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: No?

1 SEN. FRASER: Were any of your expert
2 witnesses brought in at the expense of the state or
3 the expense of the Senate?

4 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: That is my question.

5 SEN. FRASER: No. I was asking you
6 that.

7 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: Oh, I didn't bring in
8 any expert witnesses except one from Austin, who I
9 am --

10 SEN. FRASER: None of my expert
11 witnesses were at the expense of the state.

12 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: Good.

13 SEN. FRASER: Let me clarify that. Not
14 unless Coby Shorter is on expense report for driving
15 his car in to the Capitol this morning. I don't think
16 so.

17 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: All right. Senator,
18 you talked about vote fraud and you referenced the
19 Duke of Duval and something that happened in 1948.
20 That's a long time ago. You and I discussed other
21 allegations of fraud, including one election in which
22 someone apparently bubbled in. The bubbles were
23 erased on ballots that the respective voters had not
24 bubbled in.

25 In other words, there were many ballots

1 that indicated that a voter had not voted in a
2 particular race, and apparently someone else went in
3 and bubbled in and, in effect, impacted the results of
4 the race. In that particular race, there were
5 allegations that there were more votes than ballots
6 counted in a recount. But your bill would not have
7 anything to do with correcting that kind of voter
8 fraud that was alleged at that point, would it?

9 SEN. FRASER: If you go back and examine
10 my opening comments, I said how did I move toward even
11 starting thinking about this? And I reflected that in
12 the history of the United States, there's been a lot
13 of cases where there was either voter fraud, voter
14 manipulation, stolen election, voter harvesting, that
15 there is a history out there of people attempting to
16 steal elections.

17 I also made the observation that that
18 has moved people toward losing faith in the system.
19 And if they lose faith in the system and they think
20 their vote is not going to count, they don't go vote.
21 That might have something to do with the fact that we
22 have some elections that there's only eight percent of
23 the people that vote because they have no faith that
24 their vote is going to count.

25 I'm addressing one small area of the

1 law, and that is something that I think I can impact;
2 and that is, when Judy Zaffirini walks into your
3 polling place at home and you put your voter
4 registration down there, I want them to know without a
5 doubt that that is Judith Zaffirini that is voting and
6 not Tom Smith that is borrowing her -- or Thomasina
7 Smith borrowing -- it would probably be -- it would be
8 better if it was a woman, I guess, in the example.

9 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: That's all right. I
10 understand, Senator. Don't worry about it.

11 SEN. FRASER: If someone else is using
12 your card to vote, then I think you need that
13 assurance that you've got to make sure that when you
14 go to vote, that somebody has not been there, you
15 know, impersonating you, stealing your ability to
16 vote.

17 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: Quite frankly, Senator,
18 that never ever crossed my mind, except in relation to
19 the point that you're making. But never ever did I
20 feel threatened in any way.

21 My other question for you is, do you
22 have any examples at all of any Texas election in
23 which the outcome was impacted by voter impersonation?

24 SEN. FRASER: I'm going to wait until we
25 have all of our expert witnesses. They're going to

1 answer questions, and we're going to talk about the
2 election system in Texas and the ability not only to
3 impact elections but also the extreme difficulty in
4 identifying that someone cheated, and prosecuting
5 them.

6 (Brief pause)

7 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: You ready?

8 SEN. FRASER: Yes.

9 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: Senator, have you
10 considered at all the questions that many of us have
11 raised -- we who are Democrats, we who are
12 minorities -- regarding the impact, the negative
13 impact of this legislation on the turnout of
14 minorities, specifically African-Americans and
15 Mexican-Americans, and specifically in South Texas?
16 Have you considered those concerns that we have
17 raised?

18 SEN. FRASER: Senator, actually I
19 considered a lot. And I think -- you know, first of
20 all, I'm going to make a blanket statement: I want a
21 large turnout of all Texans, and I want a large
22 turnout of minorities, making sure that they are
23 encouraged to vote.

24 And again, I would encourage you to
25 listen to the testimony of Indiana and Georgia of what

1 happened when they implemented a fair system where
2 people were comfortable that their vote was going to
3 count and what happened to the minority turnout. And
4 so the answer to your question is, absolutely. I want
5 to make sure that -- I want everyone in Texas to vote
6 in large numbers, and I want the minorities, the
7 African-Americans and the Hispanics, to increase their
8 numbers.

9 And I really believe in my heart that
10 the bill that I am laying out today will do that,
11 because I think they are frustrated that their vote is
12 not counting, that there are people cheating in the
13 elections and have been cheating for a long time. And
14 if they know that their vote is going to count, I
15 think they'll be encouraged, and I think more will
16 turn out. So the answer to your question is --

17 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: I certainly have not
18 seen evidence of that cheating that you're referring
19 to, not in terms of voter impersonation. But I
20 certainly will be interested in hearing if there is
21 any. On the other hand, if our experts prove to you
22 that your bill will have a negative impact on Mexican-
23 Americans, on African-Americans, will you consider
24 amendments to alleviate our concerns?

25 SEN. FRASER: Well, first of all, in

1 response to it, I have four different papers from
2 academics around the country that address the issue
3 that you're talking about of the fact that actually
4 the minority -- impact is that minorities will turn
5 out more, and it's from actual data of what's happened
6 since these laws have been input.

7 Mr. Chairman, could I possibly move that
8 these be added or entered into the record?

9 SEN. DUNCAN: You can do that at this
10 time. I think we'll have -- those will be Exhibits --
11 what numbers? We'll bring them down to the front and
12 mark them.

13 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: Thank you, Senator.
14 I've asked you about the negative impact on Mexican-
15 Americans, on Hispanics in general, on African-
16 Americans. Have you considered the negative impact on
17 the elderly, specifically persons over the age of 65,
18 and how they will be able to prove their
19 identification? What about --

20 SEN. FRASER: Senator, I don't know
21 about you, but I'm getting close to that range. And,
22 obviously, I am concerned about people in that range.
23 I'm concerned about my mother that is in a retirement
24 center and are there, and I spend a lot of hours at
25 the retirement center talking to those people,

1 asking -- I've asked them -- you can't imagine the
2 number of questions I've asked about the way they
3 vote, what they're following -- you know, what the
4 habits are.

5 And I think the assurance I can give to
6 you is that, first of all, the bulk of the people that
7 are over 65 -- some that have stopped driving -- the
8 bulk of those and probably a high, high percentage
9 vote by mail. I am not impacting that in this
10 legislation. So everything they have done in the past
11 in the ability to vote to mail stays exactly the same.

12 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: Have you considered a
13 possible negative impact on persons with disabilities,
14 including those who live in institutions such as
15 nursing homes?

16 SEN. FRASER: And again, I guess I would
17 throw my mother in that category. My mother is
18 wheelchair-bound. I know that just even me trying to
19 get her into my car to take to the doctor is a huge
20 problem. She, you know, like most of her friends,
21 votes by mail, and so she is in that category of the
22 disabled. And her voting rights will continue, as
23 will all of her friends in the retirement center.

24 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: Senator, going back to
25 your bill, on Page 6, Line 14 of your bill, you

1 itemize --

2 SEN. FRASER: I'm getting heckled over
3 here. People from the other side are moving over
4 to -- he's trying to implement the egg-timer rule of
5 three minutes.

6 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: I see.

7 SEN. FRASER: I'm for that.

8 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: Well, on Page 6, Line
9 14 of your bill, you list types of documentation that
10 you acceptable as proof of identification under this
11 chapter. In 2007, in House Bill 218 which you
12 sponsored in the Senate, you included a student
13 identification card as proof of identification, as
14 acceptable documentation, but a student ID card is not
15 included in your 2009 bill. Could you explain why?

16 SEN. FRASER: Senator, could I refer you
17 to Section 6.

18 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: What line, what page,
19 Senator?

20 SEN. FRASER: It is -- just a second.
21 The reference you're making is the public institutions
22 of higher learning, the student ID card is still
23 included. The wording changed, but it's covered by
24 No. (6) (A).

25 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: So you're saying that

1 on Page 6, beginning at Line 8 where it reads, "a
2 valid identification card that contains the person's
3 photograph and is issued by:

4 (A) An agency or institution of
5 the federal government; or

6 (B) An agency, institution, or
7 political subdivision of this state," you're saying
8 that that would include institutions of higher
9 education and that, therefore, student identification
10 cards would be acceptable proof of identification?

11 SEN. FRASER: Yes.

12 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: Good.

13 SEN. FRASER: Isn't that what that says?
14 It says "an agency, institution or political
15 subdivision of this state." The University of Texas
16 is considered a subdivision of the state. It says
17 that an identification card that contains a person's
18 photograph that is issued by. I think the answer to
19 your question is "Yes."

20 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: All right. In your old
21 bill -- I'm looking at it now -- you have this
22 language -- and in addition to that, you specified the
23 student identification card. But so long as you
24 clarify your legislative intent, that's acceptable to
25 me.

1 But a related question, Senator: In
2 that section, you list many, many types of acceptable
3 proof of identification, including a certified copy of
4 a birth certificate, United States citizenship papers,
5 an original or certified copy of the person's marriage
6 license or divorce decree. And finally on Page 7,
7 Lines 1 and 2, you include court records of the
8 person's adoption, name change or sex change. Could
9 you explain why you included sex change as an
10 acceptable documentation and proof of identification?

11 SEN. FRASER: I believe we're going to
12 punt to the House sponsor. This was the language that
13 was passed out of the Texas House last year. We
14 picked up the bill from an amendment that was added in
15 the House. And as our starting point, the legislation
16 that we never voted on last year that we brought over
17 from the House, that language is in there. So I guess
18 I would say I'm not advised.

19 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: All right. And I'm
20 sure that you can find out why, perhaps, and answer me
21 on the floor --

22 SEN. FRASER: Some of it was being
23 inclusive.

24 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: -- through the Senate
25 debate.

1 I do have a related question. Going
2 back to our student identification card, that
3 references public universities. But what about
4 students in private institutions.

5 SEN. FRASER: Not included.

6 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: They're not included.
7 Was that an oversight? Do you intend to include them
8 at a later date?

9 SEN. FRASER: The answer to that is that
10 it's not an intentional exclusion. The concern on it
11 is us not knowing every private institution in the
12 state and the way their IDs are administered. A state
13 institution, we have some input and control. And I
14 guess the answer to that is, if you have a mechanism
15 for that, I'm willing to listen. It is not -- the
16 answer is not that we're -- we're not trying to
17 prohibit. It's just that those particular groups, we
18 don't have the ability to at least observe or regulate
19 the IDs they're putting out.

20 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: But to summarize, then,
21 and to make sure that I understands, a student
22 identification card issued by a public institution
23 would be considered proof of identification that is
24 acceptable under your bill. But a student
25 identification card issued by a private institution of

1 higher education would not be?

2 SEN. FRASER: As the bill is currently
3 written.

4 SEN. ZAFFIRINI: Thank you very much,
5 Senator. I appreciate your courtesy.

6 SEN. FRASER: Yes.

7 SEN. DUNCAN: Before we go to the next
8 questioner, let me just kind of clarify the record. I
9 have some -- Sen. Shapleigh -- and I think if you're
10 going to put something in the record, you need to
11 identify it. Sen. Shapleigh had submitted Exhibit 6,
12 which is the vote tally on the Gallegos motion to
13 appeal the ruling of the Chair. Exhibit 7 is a
14 document, "The Effects of Photographic Identification
15 on Voter Turnout in Indiana," submitted by
16 Sen. Fraser. Exhibit 8 is an article or a document
17 entitled "Much-hyped [up] Turnout Record Fails to
18 Materialize, Convenience Voting Fails to Boost
19 Balloting." Exhibit 8. And then Exhibit 9 submitted
20 by Sen. Fraser is "The Empirical Effects of Voter-ID
21 Laws: Present or Absent?"

22 I think Exhibit No. -- yes, No. --
23 that's all there are. So those will be in the record.

24 Exhibit 10 is "A Report of the Heritage
25 Center for Data Analysis" submitted by Sen. Fraser.

1 (Exhibit Nos. 6 through 10 marked and
2 admitted)

3 SEN. DUNCAN: Sen. Ellis. Or I'm sorry.
4 Sen. Whitmire.

5 SEN. WHITMIRE: Thank you,
6 Mr. President.

7 Sen. Fraser, to clarify a few things
8 that you mentioned earlier, you mentioned that Indiana
9 and Georgia voting occurrence. What year was that?

10 SEN. FRASER: The Indiana voting, the
11 first one was in 2006. The second was in 2008.

12 SEN. WHITMIRE: I think I --

13 SEN. FRASER: Excuse me a second. And
14 Georgia was in 2008.

15 SEN. WHITMIRE: Well, don't you agree
16 that everywhere in the country, every state had a
17 greater participation this year, primarily because of
18 the popularity of our presidential candidates and also
19 the severe economic conditions? Particularly I would
20 focus on Indiana. Why would you use the Indiana
21 increase in voting as an indication of anything, other
22 than they were very energized about the selection of
23 candidates and because of their unemployment rate and
24 their severe economic downturn? Wouldn't that --

25 SEN. FRASER: Senator, you're making

1 wonderful subjective argument. We have an objective
2 person that is about to testify before us that will
3 give you very clear answers that the Indiana guy
4 knows --

5 SEN. WHITMIRE: Sure.

6 SEN. FRASER: -- what their results were
7 and he knows what the surrounding states were.

8 SEN. WHITMIRE: Well, I haven't heard
9 from him. I can only go by your trying to compare
10 Indiana to Illinois, and that you said Indiana had
11 such an increase over Illinois. And I think empirical
12 data, would you not agree, would show that Indiana or
13 Illinois always has high voter participation?

14 What also I would like to ask you, would
15 you not agree that Georgia, it has been well recorded
16 that the African-American vote this year, because of
17 President Obama, was a significant increase in
18 turnout? So I just really don't know if that's an
19 indication that your new mechanism works so well in
20 those two states.

21 And, in fact, I would ask you: Do you
22 think it's even a reasonable comparison -- Georgia and
23 Indiana with Texas -- when you look at our size, our
24 diversity, our language issues? Why would you use
25 those two to indicate what Texas is going to follow?

1 SEN. FRASER: You know, the great thing
2 about this, Dean, is that we're allowed to bring in
3 experts from those states.

4 SEN. WHITMIRE: We're going to listen to
5 them?

6 SEN. FRASER: We have the person that
7 runs the elections in those states that can answer
8 your question. And I -- you know, I think it's great
9 that they're here today.

10 SEN. WHITMIRE: Well, I assume they're
11 partisan officials as well. How about elected
12 officials? Did I not read your county clerk said in
13 her long tenure as your county clerk had never seen
14 anyone impersonating a voter in your own district?
15 Did I not read that correctly?

16 SEN. FRASER: You know, someone reported
17 to me that she had said that she had not identified
18 it. But she also said she was supporting the bill --

19 SEN. WHITMIRE: She supports the bill.

20 SEN. FRASER: Just a second. You asked
21 me the question; I get to answer it. She said that
22 she supports the concept --

23 SEN. WHITMIRE: Sure.

24 SEN. FRASER: -- of voter
25 identification. The question was asked by the

1 reporter, "Have you caught someone impersonating
2 someone?" The thing that she didn't add to that, that
3 if the reporter would have asked that, "Does the state
4 and your office have the mechanism to identify if
5 someone is voting illegally?" and here would be the
6 example that I would use, is that if Tom Smith came in
7 with Bill White's identification card and Bill White
8 is on the registration roll --

9 SEN. WHITMIRE: I've heard it. You said
10 it --

11 SEN. FRASER: But just a second.

12 SEN. WHITMIRE: You've done that two or
13 three times. I'm familiar with that. You used it
14 earlier.

15 SEN. FRASER: Okay.

16 SEN. WHITMIRE: And that leads me to my
17 question.

18 SEN. FRASER: You wanted an answer to
19 the question.

20 SEN. WHITMIRE: No. I understand.
21 You've used about three examples of where someone runs
22 to the mailbox and gets someone else's certificate and
23 then runs and votes. It's the same identical example
24 you're using right now, which leads me to a very
25 specific question:

1 Do you not know that that is against the
2 law and it's a third degree felony?

3 SEN. FRASER: Okay. And I would ask
4 you --

5 SEN. WHITMIRE: What you're trying to
6 address is against the law. And would it make a
7 difference to you and would you still be in favor of
8 your bill if I told you we can enhance that penalty?

9 SEN. FRASER: Dean, I think if we can
10 get past this portion of this, that y'all are asking
11 me questions that could be asked of an expert witness.
12 We have somebody from the Secretary of State's office
13 that is going to clarify: Is that possible and is it
14 possible to catch them and is it possible to
15 prosecute? And I think you're going to be surprised
16 at the answer.

17 SEN. WHITMIRE: No, I'm not going to be
18 surprised at the answer, because I've been running for
19 office 36 years. It's not only -- Troy, would you not
20 agree, my duty and your duty as public officials is to
21 prevent fraud, but we have a very special reason --
22 because on the ballot. I have been in barnburners. I
23 have been in close elections. I have tried to
24 identify voter fraud. And that leads me -- and it's
25 never existed in the tough races that I've been in.

1 And I would suggest, can any one of the
2 31 senators document and demonstrate where voter fraud
3 has been an issue in their election? I would suggest
4 to you early on, perhaps in mail-in ballots, we were
5 concerned. But on Election Day, there is safeguard
6 after safeguard.

7 But I do agree with you -- and each and
8 every one of us I think would agree -- if we could
9 identify fraud, we would want to prosecute. But the
10 interesting thing is, I'm going to ask you before I
11 sit down, give me a recent occurrence of voter fraud.

12 SEN. FRASER: Johnny --

13 SEN. WHITMIRE: The cite in Duval
14 County, that was the year I was born. Then you cited
15 dead people voting. Would a voter ID have helped
16 those people, prevented them from voting? Give me an
17 example.

18 SEN. FRASER: I hate to keep giving you
19 the answer, but you're about to have the registrar
20 from Houston that's about to come up here and testify,
21 and they're going to talk about the dead people that
22 voted. And I'm going to show you --

23 SEN. WHITMIRE: That --

24 SEN. FRASER: Just a second. You asked
25 a question. Right here in my records, I've got it

1 here, but I had rather wait on the expert witness, but
2 this is a dead person that voted in person.

3 SEN. WHITMIRE: Were they prosecuted?
4 The person that voted them fraudulently, was that
5 person prosecuted? And if she shows up and she didn't
6 file charges against them, we ought to all be
7 outraged. I'm just curious. What are you trying
8 to --

9 SEN. FRASER: Ask that question.

10 SEN. WHITMIRE: What are you trying
11 to --

12 SEN. FRASER: Ask that question of the
13 witness.

14 SEN. WHITMIRE: I look forward to it.
15 This is my concern: What are you trying to fix? Can
16 you point to a recent fraudulent act that would
17 justify us changing the Senate rules, having a special
18 order, not addressing property tax increases, highway
19 funding? What are you trying to address that is such
20 a high priority?

21 SEN. FRASER: John, this, you know --

22 SEN. WHITMIRE: No. I'm really serious.

23 SEN. FRASER: I know. But --

24 SEN. WHITMIRE: We just went through a
25 historical election --

1 SEN. FRASER: Do you want me to answer?
2 Would you like for me to answer or do you want to
3 interrupt me?

4 SEN. WHITMIRE: Yes, yes. What are you
5 fixing that would shove everything else aside and take
6 this up today?

7 SEN. FRASER: This is not rocket
8 science. What I am fixing is the very real: Is there
9 a possibility -- of which we're going to show that it
10 is -- that someone could steal your registration card
11 and they could go and vote, representing to be you,
12 and that there is no way to identify when it's
13 happening. And once it happens, it's almost
14 impossible then to prosecute after the fact.

15 SEN. WHITMIRE: Okay. Let me ask you
16 this -- and I look forward to hearing our witness.
17 Let me ask you this: When you compare Indiana and
18 Georgia, are you familiar at all with how they conduct
19 their elections in terms of their poll workers, their
20 training, their compensation, any qualifications to
21 hold an election? What are the requirements in
22 Georgia, Indiana, relative to our qualifications?

23 SEN. FRASER: Dean, one of the great
24 things -- the answer I just gave Sen. Zaffirini -- the
25 great thing about this process, we bring in expert

1 witnesses from those states.

2 SEN. WHITMIRE: Yes.

3 SEN. FRASER: They know the answers to
4 those questions. My expert witness is about --
5 they'll answer that exact question that you have.

6 SEN. WHITMIRE: Because I think what
7 you're going to find is, in these other states, they
8 compensate them in a greater detail, they have
9 training for them. And we depend on volunteers, often
10 our senior citizens. And often we have precincts in
11 Harris County that we literally cannot find people to
12 serve, and we actually merge and combine precincts
13 because of the lack of individuals available to run
14 these elections. And then you're proposing an
15 elaborate documentation.

16 SEN. FRASER: Dean, you're my friend. I
17 respect your right to ask this. But the last three
18 persons have all asked the same questions. And my
19 responses have been the same: We have expert
20 witnesses that are about to show up that can answer
21 your questions. And I guess I tell you no matter how
22 many ways you ask it, my response is going to be the
23 same. I think we need to cut this off and start the
24 witnessing.

25 SEN. WHITMIRE: Well, I look forward to

1 talking to the person from Harris County. And if
2 someone fraudulently voted for someone who is
3 deceased, I would hope we find out why they weren't
4 prosecuted. And I would also -- as we continue, I
5 wish you would ask your witnesses for the most recent
6 incidence of voter fraud that they're familiar with
7 and the outcome in terms of prosecution.

8 We've had a senator -- Sen. Williams was
9 rightfully concerned about some allegations he had
10 heard. The same question was to him at that moment a
11 couple of months ago: Were the people prosecuted? I
12 think we've got the toughest Penal Code in the United
13 States, 10 to 20 for fraudulently voting for someone.
14 And I think we ought to actively prosecute them,
15 because none of us want to participate in a campaign
16 or serve in a body that is governed or controlled or
17 influenced by voter fraud.

18 I don't think it exists. And I think
19 the harm is being done because we're not in Finance
20 this afternoon, we're not dealing with Texas Youth
21 Commissions this afternoon, we're dealing in fighting
22 something that does not exist. And as it is going to
23 be documented by our witnesses, going to create a
24 hardship for thousands of Texans.

25 SEN. DUNCAN: Sen. Ellis?

1 SEN. ELLIS: Thank you, Mr. President.

2 Senator, I know you're tired. I'll try
3 not to take too long. One question I want to ask you
4 is about the provisional ballot. You said when you
5 first began answering questions from Sen. Watson, that
6 everyone would be able to vote, no one would be turned
7 away. Now, how would that process work if someone
8 doesn't have the forms of identification that are laid
9 out in your bill.

10 SEN. FRASER: I believe Coby Shorter is
11 right over here. He's going to be coming up to visit
12 with you in just a second. He will give you all that
13 data. And I believe our expert witnesses -- and I
14 think I told Sen. Watson that.

15 SEN. ELLIS: Well, now, here is what I'm
16 getting at: I know you're tired, Senator.

17 SEN. FRASER: No. I'm doing good.

18 SEN. ELLIS: The only reason I'm asking
19 you this is because you're carrying the bill, not your
20 resource witnesses, so it's not personal. Here is
21 what I'm getting at: I'm assuming, the way I read
22 your bill, if somebody does not have the forms of ID
23 you lay out, they will be told, "You can cast a
24 provisional ballot." So here is my question: When
25 does that ballot get counted? What does it take for

1 that provisional ballot to be counted?

2 SEN. FRASER: And when my witness comes
3 up -- that is the Assistant Secretary of State -- they
4 will tell you the procedure that is used for that.

5 SEN. ELLIS: Okay. I'm guessing, but I
6 assume that if somebody does that have that ID and
7 they cast a provisional ballot, the burden is on them.
8 The bill doesn't lay it out, but I assume the burden
9 is on them to then go home or go somewhere and prove
10 who they are or that ballot will not be counted. And
11 that's what my question was.

12 SEN. FRASER: Let me ask you, if you
13 were getting on an airplane and you didn't take your
14 ID, is the burden on the airport to run to your house
15 to get your ID for you?

16 SEN. ELLIS: Well, here is a minor
17 distinction. I don't have a constitutional right to
18 get on an airplane. That's a big difference. Let me
19 give you, if I might, a few other points, Senator.
20 You used Georgia a number of times as, I guess, a
21 building block for this legislation. Is that a fair
22 assessment? You were saying that they do this in
23 Georgia, Georgia is comparable to Texas?

24 SEN. FRASER: I don't know that we use
25 it as a building block. I said that they have passed

1 a near identical bill. It has passed DOJ. It has
2 passed the court system and been put into law. And
3 they've had an election cycle. And we have the
4 voting -- the people that ran the election in Georgia,
5 here. And I guess I would lay it out that I think the
6 facts will speak for themselves. I don't think I'm
7 laying out Georgia as an example; I think Georgia is
8 their own example.

9 SEN. ELLIS: Well, I want to make sure
10 that you and other members do understand a basic
11 distinction between Georgia and Texas. The State of
12 Texas is the third minority -- majority minority state
13 in the country -- new Mexico, California and then
14 Texas. Georgia's population at best, Hispanic
15 population, may be 7, may be 9 percent. There is a
16 big distinction between Georgia and Texas.

17 When you came up, Senator, you made
18 reference to -- I guess giving us a history lesson
19 about voter fraud issues, and you mentioned Duval
20 County in particular. And being a proud graduate of
21 the LBJ School and a beneficiary of the great
22 legislation that President Johnson signed into law
23 after an historic march that went on this past weekend
24 across the Edmund Pettis Bridge, I want to give you a
25 little bit of a history lesson.

1 Do you have any idea in what year the
2 State of Texas enacted the poll tax?

3 SEN. FRASER: I'm sorry. I'm not
4 advised. I don't have that number.

5 SEN. ELLIS: The State of Texas enacted
6 the poll tax in 1901. Do you have any idea when the
7 Democratic Party, not just in Texas but in a number of
8 states, enacted the while-only primary system where
9 you have to be white in order to vote in a primary?

10 SEN. FRASER: Still I'm sorry. I don't
11 have that number.

12 SEN. ELLIS: 1923. It was not abolished
13 until 1944. The poll tax, of course, was not
14 abolished until 1966. I want to say that to you,
15 Senator, because when this bill didn't open up, 1885
16 or whenever it opened up, there were people who sat in
17 desks, these desks, in chairs not quite as comfortable
18 as the ones that you and I are sitting in today, or
19 standing on this floor, didn't have this nice carpet,
20 something, didn't have the padding under it. But
21 decisions were made over the history of this state
22 which is why we have to be pre-cleared before making
23 this change or any other one.

24 Now, Georgia is similar to Texas in one
25 way. It, alone with a number of other southern

1 states, do have to be pre-cleared because of their
2 legacy of putting hurdles in the path of people to be
3 able to vote.

4 SEN. FRASER: We recognize they are a
5 Section 5 voting rights state, that the two states
6 are, you know, alike in that way.

7 SEN. ELLIS: Are you aware -- you
8 mentioned that the Department of Justice pre-cleared
9 Georgia's voter ID plan. You do know Georgia had not
10 one but two voter identification bills. You are aware
11 of that, I assume. The first bill that Georgia had
12 was pre-cleared by the Justice Department by someone
13 who is one of your witnesses today, by the way, a
14 political appointee at the Justice Department. And
15 then the state and federal courts struck it down, and
16 then Georgia went back and redid their voter
17 identification law. Are you aware of how much they
18 spent on informing voters how to comply with their
19 voter identification law in Texas?

20 SEN. FRASER: And again, same answer
21 I've given the last three, now you're fourth, is that
22 my witness from Georgia is very prepared to go over
23 the details of that rather than you asking me, because
24 I can't be an expert on the Georgia law.

25 SEN. ELLIS: And only -- as painful as

1 it is to do it, particularly with you being my desk
2 mate -- it is your bill -- Georgia spends \$500,000.
3 Now, I'm only making that point because you put
4 Georgia on our mind, not me. Georgia is probably --

5 SEN. FRASER: I --

6 SEN. ELLIS: -- a great state, might be
7 one-fifth, one-sixth the size of Texas. They spent a
8 half a million dollars a year to make sure people know
9 the provisions under that law. Senator, you made
10 reference to the Carter-Baker Commission when you
11 initially started. Do you know the genesis of that
12 commission? Do you know --

13 SEN. FRASER: We're about to have a lady
14 come up here in just a minute that is from that
15 commission that I bet will give us the entire genesis.

16 SEN. ELLIS: I'm going to ask her a lot
17 of questions. The only reason I raise it to you is,
18 sometimes -- not all the time, but sometimes these
19 senators tend to listen to other senators,
20 particularly the person who is carrying the bill, as
21 opposed to somebody who has testified for it.

22 That bill was created, that commission
23 was created in part to try and restore confidence in
24 the American electoral system, not just in our eyes
25 but in the eyes of people all around the world,

1 Senator, because of the election of 2000 in which a
2 lot of people think there were serious problems in
3 that election of 2000, and that's why this Commission
4 was established, a very bipartisan commission.

5 Even if President Jimmy Carter and
6 Secretary Baker were on different sides in their 2000
7 race, they realized, when developing nations were
8 saying, "Y'all need to have President Carter send a
9 group down here to monitor elections in America,"
10 instead of going to developing countries. Do you have
11 any idea who some of the other people were Senator, on
12 the Carter-Baker Commission?

13 SEN. FRASER: I bet we're going to hear
14 that from my expert witness.

15 SEN. ELLIS: Raul Yzaguirre. I mention
16 that because he's one of the most noted Hispanic civil
17 rights leaders in the country. I don't mention that
18 to help your side to this argument. Also former
19 Congressman Bob Michel, a very distinguished group of
20 American citizens from both sides of the aisle. Do
21 you have any idea, Senator, how many pages were in the
22 Carter-Baker Commission Report?

23 SEN. FRASER: I didn't get that quite.
24 How many what?

25 SEN. ELLIS: 130. I only read -- 113. I

1 was going to say, I thought it was 115. If you count
2 the nice pictures in the back --

3 SEN. FRASER: Are you --

4 SEN. ELLIS: 115 pages. Senator, do you
5 have any idea how many recommendations there were in
6 the Carter-Baker Commission Report?

7 SEN. FRASER: I would suspect that the
8 lady coming up from the Carter-Baker Commission could
9 possibly have that information if you asked her.

10 SEN. ELLIS: Do you have any idea what
11 the real name of that Commission was?

12 SEN. FRASER: I'm not advised.

13 SEN. ELLIS: It was the Help America
14 Vote Act and the Voting Rights Act. That's what the
15 Commission was created for. Senator --

16 SEN. FRASER: And I would suspect that
17 the recommendations was made for vote identification
18 that increased the voter turnout in Indiana and in
19 Georgia for record turnout, they were successful that
20 they encouraged -- "We're going to help people vote,"
21 and they encouraged people to feel more comfortable
22 about their voting rights.

23 SEN. ELLIS: But --

24 SEN. FRASER: And I suspect my witnesses
25 that you're going to hear are going to tell you that.

1 SEN. ELLIS: Good try but not quite.
2 You referenced a New York Times editorial a little
3 earlier. I'm going to try to be a little more
4 balanced than you were, my desk mate, in reading your
5 provision from that editorial, that op ed by President
6 Carter and Secretary Baker. It was titled, "A Clearer
7 Picture on Voter ID," February 3, 2008. Here is just
8 a snippet that I think gives a pretty good --

9 SEN. FRASER: Is that about a snippet?

10 SEN. ELLIS: -- of both sides of the
11 issue. It says in the fourth paragraph, "No state has
12 yet accepted our proposal. What's more, when it comes
13 to ID laws, confusion reigns. The laws on the books,
14 mainly backed by Republicans, have not made" -- I
15 don't want to lick my finger here and try to turn this
16 page, so don't give me a hard time -- "have not made
17 it easy for voters to acquire an ID. At the same
18 time, Democrats have tended to try to block voter ID
19 legislation outright -- instead of seeking to revise
20 that legislation to promote accessibility."

21 Here is the point that they were trying
22 to make, Senator. Out of those 113, or 115 pages if
23 you count the pictures, they had a series of things to
24 help Americans have more confidence in their voting
25 system and also to encourage more people to vote,

1 things like say their registration, restoration of
2 ex-offenders' right to vote, states spending
3 significant amounts of money in educating people on
4 how to vote. And, Senator, the most important part
5 was having a uniform, universal form of
6 identification, HAVA, as we have referred to it a
7 number of times.

8 Sen. Estes, my other desk mate here, may
9 have forgotten this. But last session you were quoted
10 in the paper as saying, "It will cost too much money
11 for the State of Texas to comply with the HAVA
12 legislation."

13 What I'm saying to you, Senator, is I
14 don't think it's appropriate to pick and choose which
15 parts of the Carter-Baker recommendation, their
16 report, you want to implement, because when you do,
17 you don't do justice to it. Senator, you made
18 reference to not using this legislation to impact
19 mail-in ballots. Why?

20 SEN. FRASER: Is this a question or were
21 you --

22 SEN. ELLIS: Why is it that your bill
23 does not touch mail-in ballots?

24 SEN. FRASER: Why?

25 SEN. ELLIS: Yes.

1 SEN. FRASER: Well, it's like a lot of
2 legislation we pass. We fix a piece of the puzzle at
3 a time. The mail-in ballot is a huge problem. It is
4 something absolutely that at some point we're going to
5 have to address.

6 SEN. ELLIS: Senator --

7 SEN. FRASER: But today I'm addressing
8 the recommendation of -- the Carter-Baker Commission
9 recommended that we put in voter photo ID legislation.
10 And I'm moving toward what other states have done,
11 which is Indiana and Georgia, that I'm taking a baby
12 step today toward that. But I think what I'm doing
13 will encourage all turnout, but more especially
14 minority turnout in Texas.

15 SEN. ELLIS: You made reference to Steve
16 Wolens' comment earlier. Are you aware that the
17 reference, the comment that you are taking was
18 referring to mail-in ballots?

19 SEN. FRASER: Absolutely. And I would
20 also remind you, you voted for that bill --

21 SEN. ELLIS: Oh, I did.

22 SEN. FRASER: -- because he had been
23 fraud -- his exact statement was, is "They are
24 harvesting" --

25 SEN. ELLIS: Yes.